

PLEASE RETURN TO  
The Lutheran World Federation  
News Bureau  
17, route de Malagnou  
GENEVA SWITZERLAND

# LUTHERAN WORLD

PUBLICATION OF THE  
LUTHERAN WORLD FEDERATION

SEPTEMBER

1959

Vol. VI, No. 2

LUTHERANISM AND THE  
ORTHODOX CHURCH

EDUARD STEINWAND

THE CONTRIBUTION OF EASTERN ORTHODOXY TO THE  
ECUMENICAL MOVEMENT

ARCHBISHOP IAKOVOS

CHURCH, STATE AND SOCIETY  
- AN ORTHODOX VIEW

HAMILCAR ALIVISATOS

THE GREEK VERSION OF THE  
AUGSBURG CONFESSION

GEORGES FLOROVSKY



# CONTENTS

Lutheranism and the Orthodox Church, by Eduard Steinwand . . . . .	122
The Contribution of Eastern Orthodoxy to the Ecumenical Movement, by Archbishop Iakovos . . . . .	140
Church, State and Society—An Orthodox View, by Hamilcar Alivisatos . . . . .	148
The Greek Version of the Augsburg Confession, by Georges Florovsky . . . . .	153

## FROM THE WORK OF THE LUTHERAN WORLD FEDERATION AND THE ECUMENICAL WORLD

Geneva Diary, by Carl E. Lund-Quist . . . . .	156
<i>Committee on Latin America</i>	
Not More Religion but a Dynamic Faith, by Stewart Herman . . . . .	159
<i>Conference of European Churches</i>	
Nyborg Neighbor, by Werner Jentsch . . . . .	162
<i>East Asia Christian Conference</i>	
Kuala Lumpur: Marginal Glosses, by Bengt Hoffman . . . . .	167
<i>World Council of Churches</i>	
African Self-discovery, by Hans-Ruedi Weber . . . . .	171
<i>Announcement of Scholarships</i>	
Lutheran World Federation . . . . .	173
World Council of Churches . . . . .	176

## FROM LANDS AND CHURCHES

<i>Germany</i>	
Preview of the Munich Kirchentag, by Friedebert Lorenz . . . . .	177
<i>India</i>	
Resumption of CSI-Lutheran Conversations, by Sigfrid Estborn . . . . .	179
<i>The United States</i>	
Religion on the Campuses, by Herluf Jensen . . . . .	183
<i>Finland</i>	
Sobernost and the Churches, by Hans-Heinrich Wolf . . . . .	188

## BOOK REVIEWS

Hymnology, 1950 to 1959 (Karl Ferdinand Müller) . . . . .	190
God and Caesar (Franklin Sherman) . . . . .	194
What is Christianity? (Martin J. Heineken, Horst Beintker) . . . . .	197
One World, One Gospel (Sigurd Aske, Conrad Rendtorff, Arno Lehmann) . . . . .	201
Eucharist and Sacrifice (Vilmos Vajta, David Löfgren) . . . . .	205
A Barthian Luther (David Löfgren) . . . . .	207
CORRESPONDENCE . . . . .	211
EDITORIAL: Lutheran Publishing in the Ecumenical Era, by Hans Bolewski . . . . .	215
Editorial Notes . . . . .	218
Supplement: <i>Literature Survey</i> for September, 1959	



# LUTHERAN WORLD

PUBLICATION OF THE LUTHERAN WORLD FEDERATION

---

Vol. VI, No. 2

September, 1959

---

## TO BISHOP LILJE

*ON AUGUST 20 Dr. Hanns Lilje, Bishop of Hannover and past president of the Lutheran World Federation, celebrated his 60th birthday. At the beginning of his 61st year, Bishop Lilje can look back upon a ministry of such versatility and variety as has been granted to few churchmen in our day. God accepted the offering of those years of service and blessed it in many ways: under the stress of the German church struggle, in the solitary confinement of a prison cell, in the pulpit, in the leadership of his church and in his work on behalf of Christian unity.*

*Under the presidency of Bishop Lilje the Lutheran World Federation achieved the structure which determines its present work. From Marangu to Minneapolis it was also he who, as president of the LWF, gave the message of the Lutheran churches new relevance in the world of today.*

*When this journal was still in its infancy, Bishop Lilje repeatedly offered it the benefit of his sage and sensible advice. We should like to express our gratitude by dedicating this issue of the Lutheran World to him, an issue which testifies to the breadth of the ecumenical conversation in which Lutheranism is today engaged. May it express our wish for God's blessings on his future ministry.*

HANS BOLEWSKI



# Lutheranism and the Orthodox Church

EDUARD STEINWAND

SINCE THE DAYS of the Reformation there has been in Lutheranism no lack of earnest attempts to open relations with the Eastern Orthodox church. These attempts always remained just that, however—attempts, promising much but doomed to atrophy by unfavorable political influences exercised by church and state. Between these attempts at establishing contact there were usually long periods of mutual misunderstanding and rejection. Whether the two confessions lived in different states and cultures, or whether they lived side by side under the same ruler, made no appreciable difference in this respect, although in the latter case linguistic and cultural differences were no longer decisive.

## The Reformation and After

Ernst Benz has shown again and again how Luther never lost sight of the Eastern church and how frequently he appealed to the Fathers, particularly the Greek Fathers, of the ancient church.<sup>1</sup> The attempt to establish direct contact with the Eastern church received more concrete expression in 1559 in the translation (intended for the Patriarch of Constantinople) of the Augsburg Confession into Greek by Melanchthon and Demetrios, a Serbian deacon of the Greek church.<sup>2</sup> Not a literal rendering, it freely adapted the Latin version of the confession, taking account of the terminology of the Eastern church and treating at greater length the areas that church considers particularly important.

At the end of the 16th century some Tübingen theologians, under the leadership of Martin Crusius, succeeded in establishing contact with the Patriarch of Constantinople through the good offices of Stephan Gerlach, German chaplain to the ambassador to Turkey. Through Gerlach they placed in the hands of the patriarch a copy of the Augsburg Confession in Greek.<sup>3</sup> In the exchange of letters that followed, the way was prepared for a fruitful conversation; but once again it was broken off for years after a Roman Catholic denunciation prompted the Turkish sultan to remove the patriarch. When he was restored to office some years later, the contact with Tübingen was reestablished. But now the patriarch was more cautious, and the demarcation between the two parties became more pronounced.

Already some years previous, in the middle of the 16th century, the Reformation had extended its dynamic influence to the East. On a trip through the

<sup>1</sup> Ernst Benz and L. A. Zander, *Evangelisches und orthodoxes Christentum in Begegnung und Auseinandersetzung*, 1952, p. 103 ff.

<sup>2</sup> Ernst Benz, *Wittenberg und Byzanz*, 1949, p. 59 ff. Cf. also Georges Florovsky, "An Early Ecumenical Correspondence," in *World Lutheranism of Today, A Tribute to Anders Nygren*, p. 98 ff.

<sup>3</sup> Ernst Benz in *Orthodoxie und evangelisches Christentum: Studienheft Nr. 1*, 1949, p. 23 ff.



Hapsburg territories, David Chytraeus, a pupil of Luther's, came to know the Eastern church at first hand. The book he subsequently published reawakened interest in the Eastern church and extended existing knowledge of it. Of special significance also was the opening of a Croatian and Slovenian printing establishment in Urach in Württemberg by Baron Hans von Ungnad. The baron regarded the pope as "the first anti-Christ" and the Turk as "the second"; the first had already been defeated by the Word and now the second was also to be struck by the same power. Hence, the most important Reformation writings were translated into Southern Slavic languages and printed in Urach, along with a large number of Bibles and sermons. Since three kinds of type were used—Cyrillic, Glagolitic and Latin (for the Croatian language area)—it is evident that the influence of these writings was considerable.

### The Third Rome

After the Ottoman conquest of Constantinople on May 29, 1453, Russia came to occupy a special place in the Eastern church. The messianic consciousness of the Russian church acquired an unusual impetus, and the doctrine of Moscow as "the third Rome" arose. We encounter a pregnant formulation of it in the letters of the monk Philotheos of Pskov to the young future czar Ivan IV (b. 1530), at that time still grand duke. Philotheos says,

I should like to write a few words yet on the Orthodox Kingdom of our most illustrious, highest Ruler. In the whole earth he is the only Czar of the Christians, directing the Holy, Divine Throne of the Holy, Ecumenical, Apostolic Church. That throne is now neither in Rome nor Constantinople but in the blessed city of Moscow, the holy and renowned place where the most pure Mother of God fell asleep. In the whole earth, Moscow alone shines brighter than the sun. For know this, thou Lover of Christ and of God: all Christian kingdoms have passed away and have passed over into the one kingdom of our Ruler, the Russian Kingdom, as it is written in the books of the Prophets. For two Romes have fallen, but the third stands and there will not be a fourth. May the Czar therefore guard and protect his kingdom in reliance on God. . . . The woman clothed with the sun, with the moon under her feet, and on her head a crown of 12 stars—the Christian Church which John says [Rev. 12] fled from the dragon into the wilderness—fled from the Old Rome because of the unleavened bread. For Rome the Great has fallen; the Apollinarian heresy has made it sick unto death. The woman fled to the New Rome, which had united with the Latins at the Eighth Council. The Church in Constantinople was destroyed, but it fled to the Third Rome, Russia the Great, which is the "wilderness" [Rev. 12:6]—for [the Russians] were devoid of holy faith and the divine Apostles had not preached among them. But after it had come to all other men, the saving grace of God—the grace to know Him, the one true God—shone also on them. It alone enlightens us now, the Catholic [*sobornaiia*], Apostolic, Eastern Church, brighter than the sun in the whole world. And in the whole earth only the Orthodox, Great Russian Czar . . . directs the Church of Christ and strengthens the Orthodox faith. . . . Take heed, and grow through the grace and knowledge of our Lord.<sup>4</sup>

Thus Russia now becomes the place of refuge and the nursery of the true faith. Since at this time it was also experiencing a tremendous increase in

<sup>4</sup> Hildegard Schaefer, *Moskau das dritte Rom*, 1957, pp. 75-76.



political power and was expanding its borders immensely, consciousness of a national mission became intimately associated with consciousness of a messianic mission. We are here confronted not only with a conception taken over from Constantinople along with Orthodoxy but also with a sanctified heritage, to be watched over and given new structure. It is in this period also that the Mongol yoke which had enslaved Russia for two centuries was finally thrown off (1480). The Russian church became autonomous in 1589 through the establishing of its own patriarchate in Moscow.

Despite the intertwining of national and messianic missions, as soon as jurisdictional questions arose the *symphonia* of church and state could not be taken for granted. In principle, too, conceptions of the relation of church and state diverged from the beginning.

### Opposing Streams

Joseph Sanin (1439-1515), the founder of the monastery at Volokolamsk, a guardian of Orthodoxy and a vigorous opponent of heresy, called the power of the czar an "emanation of the divine." The czars are God's representatives on earth. His view of the czars' position and their tasks, Joseph bases on Old Testament passages referring, not to the kings, but to God. Joseph also sees the czar as entrusted with the salvation of the souls of his subjects. On earth he has the task of realizing *pravda* (truth), *pravda* here involving also righteousness. What Joseph was advocating was a deification of the czar and the state.

A contemporary of Joseph, the ascetic Nil Sorsky (ca. 1433-1508), held a totally different view. On the Sora he founded a hermitage with strict ascetism but no strict order. Possession of property, especially of land, was forbidden. These Volga monks were also positive in their attitude to the state but saw in it a kingdom of this world in which all is earthly. The way to the kingdom of God was not via the state, they maintained, and they favored a separation of the spheres of church and state.

The monasteries of the Josephites were "church-state institutions," that is, not only schools of monastic discipline for the protection of dogmas and rites, but houses of correction as well. In the rule of Sorsky's monastic order, on the other hand, questions of external order are treated only in the introduction. The real content of the rule is the "mystical activity of the soul," the practice of "spiritual surrender." A Sorsky monastery was a non-compulsory school of the spiritual life. In the conflict between the two orders the Josephites emerged victorious. The monks of the Sorsky order were charged with heresy and persecuted. The so-called "ascetic" piety of Russia was always imbued with their spirit, however.

N. Alexeyev is without a doubt describing accurately the situation prevailing for centuries when he writes that "even today the half-pagan specters of Josephism hover over Russian Christianity." The stream of an intensive, inner piety also



coursed steadily, however, albeit underground. While it manifested itself less visibly than did Josephism, occasionally this submissive type of piety also attracted attention.<sup>5</sup> For all their differences, both streams of piety had something in common, the Divine Liturgy, their common order of service.

Of significance for the later development of Russian Orthodoxy is that in his relation to the Russian people and the Russian state, Ivan IV (1530-1584) allowed himself to be governed by the teaching of Joseph of Volokolamsk. At his enthronement in the Cathedral of the Ascension in the Kremlin, he assumed the title "Holy and Divinely Crowned Czar and Sole Ruler of all Russia."

The heightened political and religious messianic consciousness in Russia conveys the impression of an imposing determination, of a power totally self-sufficient. Yet there are unmistakable signs of continuing uncertainty. Alongside self-assurance one finds mistrust, alongside power, fear, alongside the impulse to expand, a compulsion to barricade oneself off, alongside magnanimity, frenzy, deriving from a constant fear of betrayal.

For relations between Lutheranism and Orthodoxy, it is of significance that the Reformation in the West took place during the reigns of Vasily (Basil) III and Ivan IV, the time when the doctrine of the third Rome was taking on religious and political reality. In influence and in size Russia was and remained the heart of Orthodoxy. On the other side, the tie between self-assurance and mistrust constituted a barrier difficult to penetrate, if for no other reason than that each ecclesiastical affair was at the same time a political affair.

Even under these circumstances there were still efforts to establish contact with the Russian church.

## The Open Window

It was impossible to carry on any real discussion with Ivan IV. A theological disputation between him and a representative of the Polish legation, John Rokyta, a pastor of the Moravian Brethren who had arrived in Moscow in 1570, was on Ivan's part really nothing but shadow boxing. His mind was made up: "Consider the unworthy way in which you swine treat the precious pearls of our Savior."<sup>6</sup> Although the pretence of a disputation was maintained, and although it was conducted in writing in the form of presentation and response, Ivan never took Rokyta seriously.

Things were similar in the political sphere. Ivan was possessed of considerable diplomatic gifts, which he also put to use. However, he looked upon himself as the sole legitimate successor of Constantine and therefore as the sole ruler of the world. When in a course of a conversation the papal legate Antonius Possevinus enumerated the most renowned of the Christian monarchs of the

<sup>5</sup> N. Alexeyev, "Das russische Volk und der Staat," in *Kirche, Staat und Mensch*, 1937, pp. 6-7, 25-27.

<sup>6</sup> Ludolf Müller, *Die Kritik des Protestantismus in der russischen Theologie vom 16. bis zum 17. Jahrhundert*, 1951, p. 23 f.



West, the czar retorted contemptuously, "Do you call them monarchs?" Possevinus' attempts at union ended with his discrediting in the eyes of the boyars.

Subsequently Halle, under August Hermann Francke, became a center of intensive contact with the East and the Russian Orthodox church. The fecundity and variety of Halle's efforts to reach out to the East are almost inconceivable. In our day these efforts have been thoroughly studied and there is a body of scholarly literature on the subject.<sup>7</sup>

Peter the Great (1672-1725) flung open wide "the window to the West." He shattered the isolation from the culture of Europe which had been Russia's fate till then. The step was a necessary one, but the precipitate and reckless way in which he carried it out shocked large sections of the population and left many emotional scars. Resistance to his efforts, and counter-movements, also arose. But there was a "window," open not only to the West but also to the East. In new fashion Russia now emerged on the horizon of the West, awakening many hopes.

After a meeting with Peter the Great, Leibniz revised completely his opinion of Russia. On political and cultural ties with Russia he pinned ambitious plans world-wide in scope and embracing also the churches. He took steps to prepare for an ecumenical council which Peter the Great was to call to "reconcile the churches of the Reformation with the Roman church through the medium of the Eastern church."

The Roman church also attempted to utilize the "open window" to the East. On June 14, 1717, Peter the Great on a visit to Paris came to the Sorbonne. In the library where he was shown manuscripts in Old Church Slavic, a discussion developed with the Roman Catholic theologians who were present. On the basis of this discussion a proposal for union was worked out in the Sorbonne in the summer of the same year, in which it was argued that union with Rome was advantageous for Russia and dogmatically feasible. The czar took no action on the proposal.<sup>8</sup>

August Hermann Francke's efforts were not in the direction of church politics. For Halle, the "open window" was simply a call summoning it to fulfill a spiritual responsibility. In any case, in its ecumenical efforts the pietism of Halle demonstrated rare magnanimity and energy.

Of special importance in this connection was the "ecumenical world traveler," Heinrich Wilhelm Ludolf, secretary to Prince George of Denmark, the consort of Ann, Queen of England. A friend of Francke, Ludolf was filled with longing for a reunion of all Christian churches through the gathering together of all the regenerate. His great linguistic gifts and his international connections opened many doors to him. In Amsterdam he made the acquaintance of Peter the Great's ambassador. He then journeyed to Russia himself and was there able

<sup>7</sup> Eduard Winter, *Halle als Ausgangspunkt der deutschen Russlandkunde im 18. Jahrhundert*, 1953; E. Benz, in Benz und Zander, *op. cit.*, p. 137 and *passim*.

<sup>8</sup> E. Benz in *Evangelium und Osten*, 1935, p. 114 f.



to observe the church life of both Germans and Russians. On his return he reported to Francke his experiences and, later on, developed a total ecumenical program. Within Orthodoxy he found, above all, an openness to the piety of German Protestant mysticism. He believed it urgently necessary to send Pietistic pastors to Russia where they would work among Germans as well as Orthodox and, perhaps, among the non-Christian peoples.

In addition to learning Russian himself Ludolf also influenced Francke to acquire a knowledge of it. From Ludolf, too, comes a small Russian-Latin dictionary of extraordinary significance for that time. And it was at his instigation that Russian and Old Church Slavic were taught in the oriental seminar established in Halle in 1702, since the young pastors to be sent from Halle to Russia would of course find knowledge of Russian invaluable.

Under these circumstances it is quite understandable that in Halle at the turn of the 18th century there should be many personal encounters with lay and clerical representatives of the Orthodox East. But the Pietistic writings which were translated and printed in Halle and sent to Russia had an effect that extended over centuries.

Especially the Russian translation of Johann Arndt's *Vier Bücher vom wahren Christentum* enjoyed an astounding circulation in Russia.<sup>9</sup> The first translation was made by the Russian theologian S. Todorsky who came to Halle some two years after Francke's death. In 1735 there came off the press the first copy of a very careful translation into Old Church Slavic of Arndt's 1426-page book. The Holy Synod later banned the book but never really took serious measures against it. It was translated into Russian more than once after that and found many readers.

During his stay in Halle, Todorsky also translated other Pietistic writings, and these too found their way to Russia.

The influence of Halle made itself felt also through the fact that pupils of Francke occupied teaching positions in Moscow and St. Petersburg, primarily in German schools but not only there. Others ministered to German congregations and, in addition, influenced the Russian system of education.

The influence emanating from Halle was subsequently stifled, but it left behind unmistakeable and persistent traces of itself.

## Lutheranism in Russia

In the history of relations between the Lutheran and Orthodox churches, Lutheranism in Russia itself constitutes a special chapter. It is virtually impossible to generalize accurately about these relations, since the situations and presuppositions were quite different in the Baltic provinces, in Poland, Finland, the capital cities St. Petersburg and Moscow, and the "colonies" in Russia.

<sup>9</sup> D. Čiževski, "Das wahre Christentum Arndts in Russland," in *Evangelium und Osten*, 1935, p. 41 ff.



We shall concentrate primarily on the Lutheranism dispersed amidst the Russian state church, i.e. in Russia proper, east of Poland and the Baltic provinces.

Even in Russia proper the establishing of Lutheran congregations can be traced back to the time of the Reformation. St. Michael's, the oldest Lutheran congregation in Moscow, possessed a charter dating from the year 1576 and containing the express provision that in this congregation "the pure doctrine of the gospel will be practiced, used and adhered to in accord with the Augsburg Confession."<sup>10</sup> The congregation was most certainly in existence before the Church of St. Michael was founded. Cvetayev cites Timan Brakel as the first Lutheran pastor in Russia whose name is known to us. During the Livonian war he had been apprehended in Dorpat where he was pastor of St. John's congregation, and in 1559 he arrived in Moscow as a prisoner. Ivan IV (the Terrible) started the war against Livonia in 1558 in order to gain access to the Baltic Sea; at the end of 25 years of fighting he had still failed to reach his goal. The first years of the war especially took a terrible toll of the Livonian population. Victorious at first, the Russians surged forward, ruthlessly laying waste the land. In the course of time they drained off the German population by deporting them to Russia as slaves. Buying the freedom of the prisoners in Livonia itself was forbidden. How great their number was cannot be determined. In 1564 around 3,000 prisoners are said to have been carried off from Smiltene, Venden, Volmar and Ronneburg; in the following year all the German inhabitants of Dorpat were deported.<sup>11</sup> Some of the prisoners were sold as slaves and some were settled in various cities and countrysides. Many also came to Moscow and were gathered together and ministered to by Pastor Brakel. His *Christlich Gesprech von der grawsamen Zerstörung in Lifland durch den Muskowiter von 58 Jahr her geschhehenn* is a moving account relating the sufferings of the prisoners and his ministry to them in Moscow, which lasted only 15 months, however, since he was then able to return to Livonia.

In addition to the deported German prisoners there were in Moscow at that time very many German merchants, soldiers, craftsmen and people of other trades and professions who had come there voluntarily. Hence only 50 years after the founding of St. Michael's congregation, the Church of St. Peter and Paul came into being. Called simply the "New Church" at first, it later was called the German Officers' Evangelical Church, since a large proportion of the congregation consisted of German officers serving in Russia and their families. The third Protestant church in Moscow, built in 1629, was Reformed.

In the course of the 17th century Lutheran congregations came into being in most of the large trading centers of Russia, in Archangel (1669), e.g., in the far north on the White Sea, and in Astrakhan (1702) in the far south on the Caspian Sea. From the beginning a goodly portion of the inhabitants of St. Petersburg

<sup>10</sup> Theophil Meyer in *Jerusalem, du hochgebaute Stadt!*, 1931, p. 32; D. Cvetayev, *Protestanstvo i Protestanty v Rossii*, Moscow, 1890, pp. 42-43.

<sup>11</sup> Richter, *Geschichte der deutschen Ostseeprovinzen*, Vol. II, 1, 1858, p. 60.



were Protestants. They had complete freedom of worship. Up until 1917 St. Petersburg remained the city with the largest concentration of Protestants. Reformed Christians were in the majority at first, and later the Lutherans. At the turn of the 20th century Protestants constituted around 10 per cent of the population, i.e. about 90 to 100 thousand people. Of these around 94 per cent were Lutheran, with 15 congregations and 12 churches, and 6 per cent were Reformed with 6 congregations and 6 churches. The Protestant congregations had excellent primary and secondary schools, homes, hospitals and an unusually large number of institutes of the Inner Mission. Of particular significance were the "Fund for the Support of the Lutheran Church of Russia," the Protestant Bible society, and the collection of Protestant church books.<sup>12</sup> One or two German dailies were published in St. Petersburg as was a Sunday paper highly regarded all over Russia.

While we cannot go into detail here, it may be noted that on the whole Lutherans and Reformed took an active part in the cultural life of this metropolitan city. Of church relations between Orthodox and Protestants, however, there were virtually none. Children of Orthodox families, especially of the upper classes, attended the Protestant secondary schools. That led to no difficulties, however, since people were tolerant, and in matters of religion maintained separate existences. An occasional breaching of the wall of separation was merely the exception that proved the rule.

The Lutheran church in Russia proper consisted, however, primarily of the descendants of German immigrants who had streamed into Russia mainly in four great waves.

Their reasons for coming were various. Some were adventurers, others people whom economic stress had forced to migrate. For no small part of the emigrants, religious reasons had motivated their decision. This factor is of great importance for the way in which these emigrants lived in Russia and for the way they thought and felt.

### Eschatology and Emigration

The eschatological expectations which we encounter in the Swabian theologians Bengel and Oetinger, in Johann Heinrich Jung-Stilling (1740-1817) take on the character of an event already in its first stages. Dark portents will precede the great event of the consummation of the world. In his *Heimweh* (1793 ff.) and his *Siegesgeschichte der christlichen Religion*, Jung-Stilling developed a picture of history which imparted alarming overtones to the eerie events which pious souls saw taking place at that time. The history of salvation was proceeding from East to West, wrote Jung-Stilling: from Jerusalem via Rome to the German tribes and on to the boundaries of the West. The countermovement, under the

---

<sup>12</sup> Hermann Dalton, *Die evangelische Kirche in Russland*, 1890, p. 7 ff.



sign of the Antichrist, was destroying the work of Christ step by step as it progressed from West to East. The French Revolution and a rationalistic theology which was undermining the church from within and paving the way for a modern atheism and materialism, are infallible signs that the eschatological testing has begun, argues Jung-Stilling. The church's main task now is to gather its members together. The official churches are already under the spell of the Antichrist. Hence it is those in all confessions who have been reborn who must gather together to oppose him. In spirit Jung-Stilling sees the true Christians from all parts of the earth and from all peoples journeying to the East, to await the return of the Lord in the place of deliverance, Solyma in Central Asia.

Even Czar Alexander I was impressed by Jung-Stilling's ideas. He met and talked to Jung-Stilling, so that the latter also made a personal impression on him. The czar believed that Russia was not yet infected by Western atheism and was therefore charged with the task of barring Russia's gates to the Antichrist's work of destruction now making its way East. In southern Germany where Jung-Stilling was accorded a prophet's honor, his ideas prompted droves of Swabian emigrants to undertake the journey to Solyma. These consequences Jung-Stilling had evidently not reckoned with, for he now tried to warn off the emigrants, pointing out that there was no real hurry about setting out for Russia—but his warning came too late.<sup>13</sup>

One may look upon this phenomenon as one will, underlying it was an earnest faith of unimpaired power. The emigrants were people with their eyes fixed on eternity. Their faith was soon stripped of its Enthusiastic accouterments by the unbelievable hardships they endured on the long journey and after they had finally arrived and settled down. That faith, tested in suffering but still trusting firmly in God, informed the faith of generations of Germans in Russia.

The immigration was guided and made possible by manifestos and edicts issued by the czars, inviting foreigners to settle in Russia and assuring them of assistance and important rights not possessed by Russians. Edicts of this sort were issued by Peter the Great (on April 16, 1702), Catherine II (on July 22, 1763) and Alexander I (on February 23, 1804). A large number of regulations issued later supplemented these edicts.<sup>14</sup>

The immigrants were assured, among other things, of complete freedom of religion, of allotments of land, freedom from military service (in force until 1874), freedom from taxation at the beginning, and various other privileges which would help them to get started.

Already in the reign of Peter the Great many foreigners flowed into Russia, settling in the vicinity of St. Petersburg and here and there in the interior. Under Catherine II, 27 to 30 thousand immigrants entered, settling primarily on the

<sup>13</sup> E. Benz, "Das Reich Gottes im Osten (Jung-Stilling und die deutsche Auswanderung nach Russland)," in *Evangelium und Osten*, 1935, p. 61 ff.

<sup>14</sup> Hermann Dalton, *Urkundenbuch der evangelisch-reformierten Kirche in Russland*, 1889, pp. 21 ff., 143 ff., 127 ff.



banks of the Volga.<sup>15</sup> At the beginning of the 19th century the fertile steppes of south Russia (Crimea and the Black Sea basin) were settled as well as regions in Transcaucasia. At the middle of the 19th century there was one last large wave of immigration, flowing this time to Volhynia and other regions on the western border of Russia. In between, smaller groups had also entered the country.

The emigrants came from Prussia, Württemberg, Hesse, Bavaria, Baden, Alsace, Switzerland and other countries. In Russia they were called "colonists" and were for the most part Lutherans.

The first period of settlement constitutes a long and sorrowful chapter. What the colonists preserved, however, was their faith and hence also their own language and culture. Their cultural achievements in Russia are a special chapter which cannot be touched upon here. Because of their steadily increasing numbers, they were continually seeking new places to settle in European Russia and in Siberia. Each year many also emigrated to America.

### Lutheran-Orthodox Relations

On the religious side too the settlers underwent a great deal, for while they enjoyed freedom of religion each village was left completely to its own resources. Villages were joined together into parishes but they had to establish and maintain their own schools and churches. Missionary activity, even among the pagan nomad peoples of the East, was strictly prohibited. Mission was reserved exclusively for the state church. As early as February 20, 1735, Czarina Anna Ivanovna (1730-1740) issued an edict which while confirming the promised "free exercise of religion" also adds that "no pastor of the aforementioned confessions [Lutheran, Reformed and Roman Catholic] shall from this time forth venture, in any way or under any pretext, to bring over to his faith any of our subjects of whatever people or class."<sup>16</sup> Later the regulation was ignored with respect to changes from one non-Orthodox faith to another, but it applied to evangelization among the Orthodox population until 1905. In Russia it was impossible to leave the Orthodox church. This resulted in terrible tragedies among the Russian sects (the Old Believers and the *Chlysty*, e.g.) and, in the 19th century, also among Protestant groups such as the *Stunda*, the Baptists, the Gospel Christians, and others. Where one of the partners in a marriage was Orthodox, the children belonged of necessity to the state church. Hence the Orthodox church bore a protective armor, but that armor also served to isolate it. There were no relations between Lutheranism and Orthodoxy. They confronted one another not as enemies, as in the Baltic provinces in the 18th century, but as strangers, in all of their life and thought. Under the prevailing circumstances it could be no other way.

<sup>15</sup> The invitations issued by Catherine II and the settling of the people who responded to them cost the crown 5, 199, 813 rubles and 23 kopecks. This sum had to be made up in the course of time. J. F. Erdmann, *Beiträge zur Kenntnis des Innern von Russland*, Vol. II, 1, 1825, p. 282.

<sup>16</sup> Hermann Dalton, *Urkundenbuch der evangelisch-reformierten Kirche in Russland*, 1889, p. 31.



One other fact contributed decisively to this situation: the colonists lived almost exclusively in the country, in self-contained settlements. In the course of time a few of these villages expanded into market towns of some size, but in nationality and religion they were, almost without exception, uniform in composition.

Until 1861 the majority of the Russian peasants were serfs and, down into the 20th century, illiterate. The "liquidation of illiteracy" was effected only after the revolution of 1917. The Orthodox church did much to train its people but very little to educate them. It fashioned the image of the Russian peasant as humble, hospitable, ready to share, eager to help, ardent and, for the most part, religious. This influence of the church was transmitted primarily through its worship service. Simple people who had never been inside a schoolroom knew their prayers and Bible stories amazingly well. The presentation of the history of salvation in the worship service, and the many Scripture readings and prayers, conveyed little concrete knowledge but enabled people to "live Orthodox lives." Even so, one still encountered massive paganism, superstition and undisciplined living.

The colonists, for the most part, in addition to regarding the guarantee of their religious freedom as an unalterable presupposition of their life in Russia were also very conscious adherents of their faith. Church and school constituted the focal point of their education.<sup>17</sup> Even in the 19th and 20th centuries one of the axioms of a new settlement was that a school had to be built at once, which on Sunday would serve as the place of worship. The smallest village had its school, since only those persons were confirmed who could read and write and knew the most important Bible stories and the catechism. A Protestant Christian had to be able to read his Bible himself and to sing from the hymnal.

Presumably the example of Hesse underlies the strict rules regarding confirmation and schooling. The order of confirmation introduced in Hesse in 1539 by Martin Bucer also brought immeasurable blessings to the German colonists in Russia. Heinrich Bornkamm is unquestionably right when he says, "Hesse had Bucer to thank for congregations which long retained their vitality, and for a system of folk schools which developed, earlier than elsewhere, out of instruction in the catechism and confirmation. Both congregations and schools proved themselves brilliantly in the Thirty Years' War."

In the German colonies the development of a system of folk schools was also intimately related to confirmation. Often it was an incredibly toilsome chore to find a suitable teacher—but he had to be found. Between the ages of 7 or 8 and 15, children attended school. In the confirmation instruction, lasting three weeks, the pastor determined which children he would be able to examine before the congregation and confirm. After a person had been

---

<sup>17</sup> The schools were not the same in all the colonies. As yet there exists no thorough study of the German school system in Russia, although a monograph has been written on the schools of the Germans on the Volga: M. Woltner, *Das Wolgadeutsche Bildungswesen und die russische Schulpolitik*, 1937.



confirmed his schooling came to an end. For the German peasant, school was still primarily the handmaid of confirmation, even after the Russian government took over the preparation and supervision of the curriculum.

The importance of the teacher in congregational life cannot be overemphasized. It was he who performed baptisms and conducted funerals and the Sunday services, in which he read the sermon. In many villages the pastor appeared only once or twice a year.

The great difference between Orthodoxy and Lutheranism in worship forms, church customs and religious instruction, resulted—when taken together with a number of measures carried out by the state—in an almost complete lack of mutual influence. There were always movements in that direction, but none ever came to fruition.

### The Work of Gossner

The work of Johannes Evangelista Gossner<sup>18</sup> (1773-1858) in St. Petersburg is not directly related to our subject, since when he was called to the Maltesian church in the Russian capital by Alexander I (as Protector of the Order of the Knights of Malta) he was still a Roman Catholic priest, and since the representative of Lutheranism in St. Petersburg, Pastor Friedrich Rheinbott, made strenuous efforts to discredit Gossner. Nevertheless, it would not be right to bypass completely the unique work which Gossner carried on in St. Petersburg since it showed exceptional promise. After a few years, however, the door that had been opened was again closed.

Gossner was in St. Petersburg from 1820 to 1824. It was known when he was called that he preached the gospel "with authority" and that he believed the church was the community of the regenerate. It was also known that his work hitherto had transcended confessional boundaries. In St. Petersburg the radius of his outreach grew in unusual fashion. Called on April 2, 1820, he was able as early as August 22, 1820, to report (in a letter to Spittler): "I am finding I have not deceived myself. There are many Lydias here, many souls whose hearts God is opening to believe what is told them from the Word of life. They devour what is preached to them, people from all classes, nations and confessions—Catholics and Protestants, Greeks and Jews, Samoyeds, Kirghiz and Kamchadals, Swedes and Finns, Germans and Frenchmen, Poles and Italians—in short people of every nation and tongue hearken to the noise [*Rumor*] created by the preaching of the gospel."

Gossner's preaching services were similar to the Evangelical order of worship. For his congregation, which did not fit into the usual confessional framework, he prepared a hymnal entitled *Sammlung auserlesener Lieder von der erlösenden Liebe* for which Černicky, a teacher of music, prepared a book of organ settings.

<sup>18</sup> Walter Holsten, *Johannes Evangelista Gossner*, 1949, pp. 31-36. E. Benz, "Johannes Gossners Tätigkeit in Russland," in *Evangelium und Osten*, 1935, pp. 21-24. Gossner was the founder of the Gossner Mission Society.



In his farewell sermon Gossner uttered the prophetic words: "In Christ's time Easter came after Good Friday. Here in Russia Good Friday comes after Easter."

Gossner also extended his influence to the Russian Bible Society, founded in 1812. The society was dissolved in 1826, two years after its president, Prince Alexander N. Golitsin (1773-1844), the minister of religious affairs and public education, had to resign his position in both the government and the Bible society (in May, 1824). Golitsin favored, as did Alexander I, a supraconfessional Christianity and was tolerant of all confessions. His opponents believed that even a translation of the Bible into Russian would be damaging to Orthodoxy.<sup>19</sup> The existing translation was in Old Slavic. The first complete translation of the Bible into Russian appeared in 1868 after the Russian Bible Society had been reestablished under Alexander II in 1863.

The fall of Prince Golitsin concluded an epoch in which the rigid confessional fronts had begun to show signs of relaxing. A reaction followed. In 1822, while Golitsin was still in office, Archbishop Philaret of Moscow had prepared, on the instruction of the Holy Synod, a catechism which reflected the influence of the revival movement and which included, among other things, the Lord's Prayer and Bible passages in Russian rather than Old Church Slavic. After Golitsin was removed, the catechism had to be revised.

### Alexander I

Failure also attended the attempts of Alexander I to foster the ecumenical idea and to transfer the principle of the Holy Alliance to the religious policy of his kingdom.<sup>20</sup> His plans were incredibly bold. He envisaged a situation in which all Christian confessions would have equal legal rights and would extend mutual recognition to one another. To this end he established the ministry for church affairs of all confessions and entrusted it with the portfolio for public education. It was his intention that the churches not only be under the administration of this one ministry but also that their constitutions be made more nearly similar. Alexander I hoped that a certain cohesion would be achieved by having in all Christian churches an episcopal polity standing in the apostolic succession. He believed furthermore that this would do away with the (to him) incomprehensible fissiparation of the Protestant churches. An objectionable hymn verse in a Lutheran hymnal was the immediate occasion for his issuing on July 20, 1819, the following order to Minister Golitsin: "The Czar considers it necessary to name a bishop, with his see in St. Petersburg, for the Protestant confession in Russia. His special responsibility will be to oversee all Protestant churches in Russia and their clergy." The same edict also provided for establishing a

<sup>19</sup> A. N. Pypin, *Religioznyi dvizheniia pri Alexandre I*, St. Petersburg, 1916, p. 81 ff.

<sup>20</sup> Ernst Benz, *Bischofsamt und apostolische Sukzession im deutschen Protestantismus*, 1953, p. 79 ff.; H. Dalton, *Verfassungsgeschichte der evangelisch-lutherischen Kirche in Russland*, p. 250 ff.



General Protestant Consistory of the Russian Empire, which was to function as the highest administrative and supervisory authority of the churches.

Great difficulties attended the carrying out of the edict. In 1820 Bishop Zacharias Cygnaeus (1763-1830), who stood in the apostolic succession, was called from Borgö to St. Petersburg, but only as bishop of St. Petersburg. Drafting a constitution for "the Protestant confession" took many years. In 1832 it was finally ready. This Church Law of 1832 was in effect until 1917. It united all the Lutheran churches in Russia (exclusive of Poland and Finland) in one church body.

### Protestant Movements

A Protestant movement developed when Russian peasants in the southern Ukraine became acquainted with the church life of the colonists. While the oppression and persecution which followed kept the movement from developing freely, the oppressors did not succeed in stifling it completely.<sup>21</sup>

Under Pastor Johannes Bohnekemper (1824-1848) the Reformed (later Lutheran) congregations of Rohrbach and Worms in the District of Kherson experienced a revival. After the revival the meetings of the "Brethren" (*Stunda*) continued to be well attended and to show much life. Evidently Russians from Osnova, seven and a half miles away, also took part in the meetings. Pastor Karl Bohnekemper, Jr., who came to Russia in 1867 knew Russian and was able to talk about spiritual matters to the Russians in the vicinity. In any case it is certain that after 1865 a group met for Bible study and prayer in the house of one Michael Ratušny. A year later a similar group, led by an Ivan Rabošapka, turned up in Lubomirka about 80 miles away.

The *Stunda* did not originally intend to leave the Orthodox church, nor did their German counterparts separate themselves from their church. But pressure began to be exerted by the police and the church as early as 1867. There were arrests, judicial proceedings, disciplinary actions, deportations and other measures. During the reign of Alexander II (1855-1881) the steps taken were still relatively mild. The government showed little inclination to subject to severe persecution peasants who were leading moral lives and breaking no laws. The church was urged instead to place capable, educated priests in the areas threatened by the revival movement. But the state church could not muster the spiritual strength to counter the movement and so turned to the use of force. The *Stunda* were thus forced to separate themselves from the church, especially after reading of the Bible was forbidden them. Soon they began to condemn icons, to recognize only baptism and Holy Communion as sacraments and to introduce adult baptism. Despite persecution they continued to grow and by 1869 *Stunda* were found in the region of Kiev.

<sup>21</sup> G. Terlecky, *Sekta Paškovcev*, 1891, p. 16 ff.; M. Klimenko, *Anfänge des Baptismus in Südrussland nach offiziellen Dokumenten*, unpublished doctor's dissertation, Erlangen, 1957.



At about the same time a Protestant movement of English origin arose in the north. Lord Reastock had come to St. Petersburg in 1874 and through his preaching in private homes (he spoke in French) had won many followers in the upper strata of society. A wealthy colonel of the guards, V. A. Paškov, soon attached himself to Reastock and through him the movement spread to all strata of society. When the meetings were prohibited in St. Petersburg in 1877, Paškov transferred them to the provinces. Although these two Protestant movements were different in origin, both *Stunda* and Paškovites (or "Gospel Christians," as they called themselves later) had much in common. Some of the *Stunda* had joined the Baptists in the meantime. Paškov strove to establish ties between all the Protestant groups in Russia, but under Pobedonoscev, the influential minister of Alexander III, their persecution took on gruesome forms. In 1884 Colonel Paškov was exiled. Much of the movement went underground, and only in 1905 did the followers suddenly show themselves again, now as Baptists or Gospel Christians. Today the Baptists have absorbed all Protestant movements in Russia.

### Baltic Cooperation

We want to mention briefly yet an example of successful cooperation between Orthodox Russians and German Lutherans which the political events of the second world war brought to an end.

In 1927 Dr. Oskar Schabert, pastor of St. Gertrude's in Riga, Latvia, initiated a program entitled *Baltische Russlandarbeit*.<sup>22</sup> Evangelization of the Russians on the borders of Latvia and Estonia was one branch of this work, which was developed especially in Estonia. The Russians there were poor on the whole and living in severe cultural isolation. This led to many sorry cases of demoralization. The Russian priests, working in lonely outposts and living in extreme poverty, rarely were able to buy a book. The *Baltische Russlandarbeit* tried above all to relieve the spiritual misery by sending out missionaries who preached the gospel and sought out priests in isolated villages in order to bring them up to date on events in the world outside. They also distributed New Testaments or parts thereof and other Christian literature, some of it prepared by the *Russlandarbeit*.

In collaboration with the Russian Student Christian Movement directed by Prof. L. Zander of Paris, youth work was begun in cities and villages. Retreats were conducted at which youth leaders were trained. In Petseri the young people built a two-story youth center, for which the *Russlandarbeit* needed to contribute only a few hundred crowns. In the Russian villages many children grew up in want and poverty. In the Peipus fishing village Čorny Possad

<sup>22</sup> *Russischer Evangelischer Pressedienst* (after 1934, *Evangelium und Osten*), 1928-1939; Oskar Schabert, *Die baltische Russlandarbeit*, 1931; E. Steinwand, "Die baltische Russlandarbeit," in *Beiträge und Berichte zum kirchlichen Leben der deutschen evangelischen Gemeinden Estlands*, 1934, pp. 24-34; Wilhelm Kahle, *Die Begegnung des baltischen Protestantismus mit der russisch-orthodoxen Kirche*, 1959, p. 236 ff.



a kindergarten was started to bring some of the neglected children off the streets. Initial mistrust of the "German kindergarten" vanished when the first children crossed the threshold. Later so many children wanted entrance that the space was greatly inadequate.

One of the principles of the *Russlandarbeit* was not to attack the Orthodox church but to offer it support in the difficult situation in which it found itself and to help it in the proclamation of the gospel common to both of us. Proselytizing was strictly prohibited. The work of course encountered suspicion at first since completely self-effacing acts of assistance were regarded as almost absurd. When people began to see, over the years, that there were no ulterior motives, their suspicion vanished. This was not only an encounter between Lutheranism and Orthodoxy but an example of brotherly cooperation carried out in mutual trust and confidence. The work was directed by the *Russlandarbeit*, but the Russians wanted it no other way.

In 1932 and 1934 the *Russlandarbeit* also organized conferences of Russian priests and German pastors who spoke Russian. Held at Narva, the conferences consisted of Bible study, lectures and very frank discussions of the work being done in the churches. Here too the last remnants of suspicion vanished. Some of the people working in the *Russlandarbeit* were Orthodox and some Lutheran. Now, however, it became a rule that the Protestant missionaries were asked to preach the sermon in the Orthodox service of worship.

It must of course be added that this cooperation did not mean that the antitheses were overcome. The reverse would be more true: the Lutherans became more conscious of their own faith and the Orthodox of theirs. The Bishop of Narva, Pavel Dmitrovski, gave a succinct summary of the situation when he said to me as I was leaving my position as director of the *Russlandarbeit*: "That you and I, who appeal to the same Bible and believe in the same Christ as our redeemer, belong to different churches pains me greatly. This anomaly is a result of our sin and we must endure it for the sake of the truth. That need not hinder us from treating one another as brothers, however." The political events of 1939 and 1940 brought the work of the *Baltische Russlandarbeit* to an end.

## The Present

Even if one attempts merely to touch upon relations between Lutheranism and Orthodoxy, it is still impossible to give an overall picture. One can merely point to a few steps in a long development. Looking at the present, even this possibility is precluded. There have been so many encounters between Lutheranism and Orthodoxy and they have differed from one another so greatly, that one cannot draw any valid conclusions. The Office of External Affairs of the Evangelical Church in Germany and the headquarters of the World Council of Churches have worked tirelessly to establish and foster contacts with the Eastern church. Scholarly study of the Eastern church has begun to assume significant



proportions and publications in this area are increasing from year to year.<sup>23</sup> In addition there are a large number of private contacts with the Eastern church.

Every path has been taken which might lead to closer relations with the Eastern church in our day. Complicating these attempts is the fact that the Eastern church presents a solid front theologically but not organizationally.

Especially important has been the participation of the Orthodox church (with the exception of the Russian church, which is by far the largest) in the ecumenical movement, from the Stockholm conference in 1925 down to the present day. In the Russian church too a change of heart seems to have developed. Recently two representatives of the Moscow Patriarchate visited the headquarters of the WCC in Geneva, and a return visit to Moscow may be expected before the year is out.

Up until now a number of Protestant church leaders, professors of theology, pastors and a few laymen have also been in Moscow at the invitation of the Moscow Patriarchate; and representatives of the patriarchate have also come to Germany in response to invitations. But these contacts, valuable as they may have been, were really private in character.

Work in the Faith and Order Continuation Committees and at the Lausanne and Edinburgh conferences has shown that one can hardly speak of a rapprochement in doctrinal questions. The Evanston Assembly in 1954 also confirmed this impression.

It is significant, however, that the Orthodox churches represented in the WCC nevertheless consider it very important to work for the cause of ecumenical cooperation.

Today it is also of value when, under the WCC scholarship program, German theological students study for a few semesters in Athens and Greek students study at German universities. Working in the actual environment of a church one is studying enriches a study program considerably.

Worth noting too are the liturgical seminars which Prof. L. Zander has been conducting in Paris for some years during the Easter season. The seminars are attended by students from all over the world, although the majority come from Germany. In the course of a week they receive a quite comprehensive introduction to the form and spirit of the the Eastern liturgy (i.e. the worship service). During Holy Week and on Easter Sunday they then attend the worship services of the Orthodox churches in Paris. In this way the students have a direct encounter with the Orthodox church, and for many of them it means arriving at a genuine understanding of the Eastern church.

Today there are many activities of this kind, aimed at leading to such encounters. Taken singly, they are of limited significance. Taken together they constitute a noteworthy factor in promoting understanding.

<sup>23</sup> Dr. Hildegard Schaefer has published some very careful studies on current issues in the Orthodox church; see her "Die Orthodoxe Kirche des Ostens," in *Kirchliches Jahrbuch*, 1949, p. 298 ff. and *Kirchliches Jahrbuch*, 1956, p. 256 ff.; also "Grundprobleme des evangelisch-orthodoxen Gespräches," in *Oekumenische Rundschau*, February, 1957.



## Future Prospects

In the field of history it is always a risky thing to make prognoses. Subsequent developments, taken as a whole, never coincide with the forecasts. Nevertheless a simple assessment of all that has been said so far leads to certain conclusions regarding prospects for the future.

Every approach that shows any promise, no matter how small, must be tried. This requires no proof. Immediate goals are no less important than are ultimate goals.

As was noted above, the doctrinal front seems to have solidified for the present. The Eastern church does not allow itself to be arraigned before the doctrinal forum of another church. Samarín's dictum still applies today: "The church does not prove its existence; *de facto* it does exist." The Eastern church believes itself to be in full possession of divine truth and therefore under an obligation to the whole world.

The viewpoint that each church has in the course of time developed especially one aspect of the Christian truth and that we must now learn from one another, finds a cool reception in the Orthodox church. "Orthodoxy is not merely an Eastern form of Christianity, one of many types of Christian piety," writes Kovalevsky. "Orthodoxy is, rather, ecumenical in its significance. If for a time the church has had to limit itself to the boundaries of the East, that does not mean that that is in accord with its nature. Its all-embracing love encompasses the whole world. Its supernatural spirit is, by its nature, not limited to earthly boundaries."

Kovalevsky is from the Russian church but his statement accords with the view held in Orthodoxy generally. Whenever there is a real encounter with Orthodoxy, however, much is learned that is only vitiated when it is given rational formulation.

Doctrinal discussions are also important for both sides; each arrives at a clearer understanding of its own viewpoint. For the Eastern church, however, much more essential is the question of how a church strives to realize its Christianity. Faith and life are one and tolerate no separation.

"Orthodoxy can be presented but not proved. Hence there is only one way to understand Orthodoxy, to experience it directly. . . . To become Orthodox one must submerge oneself in the element of Orthodoxy. One must begin to live in Orthodox fashion. There is no other way."<sup>24</sup> It is in this light that we must interpret the goal of the Russian Student Christian Movement: "The realization of life."

Wherever encounter with the Orthodox church leads to genuine understanding, both sides will be blessed as a result.

---

<sup>24</sup> Pavel Florensky as quoted in Bubnoff and Ehrenberg, *Östliches Christentum*, 1925, p. 31.



# The Contribution of Eastern Orthodoxy to the Ecumenical Movement

ARCHBISHOP IAKOVOS

MY TOPIC PLACES ME in the difficult position of analyzing a subject that no Orthodox can handle with absolute objectivity. I shall make every effort to be as positive, and as accurate and as objective as possible, however. I have chosen to divide the topic into two parts:

- I. Why does the Orthodox church participate in the ecumenical movement?
- II. How has Orthodoxy contributed in the past and how does it contribute at present in order to assist and further the ecumenical movement?

## I

As an introduction to my subject I shall quote from the opinions offered by recognized members of the ecumenical movement who have expressed their views concerning Orthodoxy.

It would take volumes to explain what Orthodoxy is or stands for. But what is it in the eyes or in the judgment of a contemporary ecumenist? The ecumenical importance of Orthodoxy was expressed in *The Kingship of Christ* by the late Dr. G. K. A. Bell, the honorary president of the World Council of Churches, when he wrote that "the full participation of the Orthodox Churches is a matter of great moment to the World Council of Churches." This was expressed more positively by Dr. Visser 't Hooft before the Provisional Committee (in the United States in 1947) when he said that "the Eastern Churches have maintained a sense of the objective reality and the cosmic dimensions of the drama of salvation which the Western Churches need to recapture" (ibid. p. 58).

This is one aspect of Orthodoxy viewed from an ecumenical angle. But Orthodoxy is a little more than that! "The Orthodox Church," according to Prof. Henri Gregoire, "has been a living force, a moral force of the first order. And to do it justice one cannot rest content to describe it merely in its present attitude, or in only one of the attitudes which it has successively assumed. Nothing can be more superficial than the reproach of 'Caesaropapism' with which it has at times been branded; nothing more inexact so far as the Orthodox Church is concerned than the charge of 'ceremonialism,' of formalism stifling the life of mysticism, for this mystic life never ceased to inspire the ascetics and at certain periods to take possession of the masses." While Henri Gregoire tries hard not to be unjust to the Orthodox Church, another writer, the Protestant author Robert Payne, in his recent book *The Holy Fire* (pp. xv and xvi), notes more positively that "what is most astonishing in the Eastern Church is this



gentle visionary quality allied with a conception of God as the *mysterium tremendum*, the starlit flood of powers sweeping across the heavens. . . . In these fine-spun imaginations, lit with the Orient sun, Christ is seen more clearly and more sharply than in the West." We have quoted so far what non-Orthodox religious leaders and authors have said about Orthodoxy. Our own concept of Orthodoxy is that it represents the Christian church's doctrine, order, worship and tradition of the first eight centuries of united Christendom. The common use of the term "Orthodox" to signify the church of the East should signify to the churches of the West that the Eastern church is committed to maintain the genuine characteristics of the one church of Christ.

Orthodoxy, being true to her history and traditions and compelled by the consciousness of her God-ordained task, is present and intends to be present and participate actively in all ecumenical conversations as long as their aim is to restore the disrupted unity of Christendom. Orthodoxy's principal aim in participating in the ecumenical movement is to make her own contribution to the sacred cause of bringing divided Christians together, and also to make known, and impart to member churches of the WCC "the riches of her faith, worship and order, and of her spiritual and ascetic life and experience" (Patriarchal Encyclical of February 6, 1952). The principle of Orthodox collaboration with the ecumenists of our century was set forth by the Patriarchal Encyclical of 1902. In this history-making encyclical, the Ecumenical Patriarch Joachim III stated that, although "our primary task is to watch over our own doctrines, we must nevertheless be also concerned for our Christian brothers and never cease our prayers for the union of all into *one*. Difficulties should not discourage us, nor should the thought of the apparent impossibility of it [church unity] stop us from engaging ourselves in the work of church unity which is dear to God or from examining existing possibilities for it; we should always remember that it is our duty to walk in wisdom, and to conduct ourselves in meekness towards our separated brothers, for they also believe in the all-Holy Trinity and take pride in being called with the name of our Lord Jesus Christ, hoping also to be saved by the grace of God." The encyclicals that were issued in 1920 and 1952 did nothing else but reaffirm this principle which forms the foundation of the ecumenical theory and practice adopted by the Constantinopolitan Patriarchate.

The Orthodox Church therefore takes part in all discussions and deliberations on church unity, because she feels it is in line with her task to inform others how she stands on this very important issue. To use the words pronounced by the Orthodox in Edinburgh (1937), "The Orthodox Church discusses 'church unity' for she believes that despite all existing difference of opinion and belief the Master and Lord is ONE—Jesus Christ, who will lead us to a more and more close cooperation for the edifying of the Body of Christ." This statement, inspired and based on the well-known passage of the Epistle to the Ephesians (4:15-16), most accurately expresses the Orthodox mind. Orthodoxy opposes



and will always oppose suggestions to the effect that we can entertain the idea of reunion on a minimum basis or confine it to a few common points of verbal statements. The Orthodox Church will continue to discuss unity, but only in the hope and prayer that it may some day be commonly understood that "where the totality of faith is absent, there can be no communion *in sacris*," and conversely, that unity in the totality of the faith is unity indeed, carrying with it communion in every necessary ecclesiastical activity. In the light of what we have so far said, it is obvious that the ecumenical movement creates no problems whatsoever for Orthodoxy. On the contrary, it creates a new atmosphere, favoring so far the hope for a fresh approach and study of the problem of "church unity." The Orthodox Church has never adopted a defeatist attitude. It is not in her nature. Difficulties, obstacles, disillusionings and even failures, often the case in the past, are not paralyzing but strengthening the belief that church reunion is still within reach. Differences in faith and order, in worship and tradition, constitute a challenge for Orthodoxy, not a reason for abstaining from ecumenical discussions. It may be a mere repetition, but the truth must be repeated and re-emphasized when forgotten or overlooked. And the truth that should always be remembered in all ecumenical circles is that there are no churches but *one*, and that this truth is more than attested by church history. The branch theory, that is, that the true church consists of the Orthodox, Roman Catholic and Anglican churches, as well as the fragmentation theory, that is, that there is schism within the church, or that all existing churches are to a greater or less degree "in schism," can find no ground of justification in church history. Orthodoxy, however, can perfectly see and comprehend present church realities. She knows all she needs to know in regard to the existing numerous communions, confessions, denominations, groups and sects.

## II

In general the Orthodox contribution to the ecumenical movement could be summarized with the following statement made by Nicolas Zernov some years ago:

The variety of reasons which bring Eastern Christians within the fold of the ecumenical movement explains the rifts and tensions which were manifested at most of the ecumenical gatherings. Yet in spite of these drawbacks, the role of the Orthodox in the development of the ecumenical movement was considerable and at times even decisive. The Orthodox were able to strengthen the desire of this new movement to find a firm foundation in sound doctrine, and they presented a view which could often reconcile the extreme wings of the Western interpretations of Christianity. They were also able to help towards satisfactory conclusions of theological debates by approaching controversial points from an angle unfamiliar to the Western spokesmen and yet consonant with the great traditions of the Church. Their presence made the ecumenical movement genuinely catholic in its scope and spirit and helped to guard against the danger of its becoming a merely pan-Protestant organization. Their chief contribution, however, was in those spheres of Christian life and worship where the Protestant West had been in the past particularly suspicious of the East; for example, in the emphasis on the Eucharist, and on veneration of the saints, and



in insistence on the necessity of recognizing the significance of the Blessed Virgin Mary in the work of reconciliation. The creation of special sub-committees on the question of the veneration of the saints at Edinburgh in 1937, and support for the inclusion of the Eucharist in the program of the conferences, were valuable gifts brought by the Orthodox into this movement of reintegration. The very opposition which they provoked and are still provoking is an indication that they have something to give which may supplement the life of the Protestant communities at the very points where they are weakest.<sup>1</sup>

Consistent with the foregoing, Orthodoxy has offered herself whole-heartedly to the ecumenical movement. First, her teachings and beliefs to the Faith and Order conferences, second, her general and particular moral and social *concepts* to the Committee on Life and Work; third, her worship, with emphasis on the very special role and meaning of worship in the lives of the Orthodox Christians. Fourth, the true image of the Christian spirit permeating the church which is usually witnessed by martyrdom. Fifth, the deeply religious, mystical and ascetic concepts of Christian experience which are discernible in the lives of her faithful as individuals and members of the family. Sixth, the sincerity with which all pronouncements are made; whether they be intended to convey the church's reservations or complaints or her official views on ecumenical matters. Finally, I refer to the Orthodox contribution of the doctrine of unity in the church as it is understood theologically and historically. In this connection I wish to stress that through the centuries as well as in recent years the Orthodox Church has demonstrated not only a favorable inclination toward unity but also an affirmative ecumenical viewpoint that surpasses the testimony of any other church to date.

Within the limits of this article it is not possible to cite details of the Orthodox contribution to the endeavors of the committees on Faith and Order and Life and Work. Actually the specific information on this phase of our participation is given in the *History of the Ecumenical Movement* from which I quoted earlier. I shall refer, therefore, only to a few points that have not been brought sufficiently to the attention of those who are concerned by ideology and personal conviction with the ecumenical activity of our century.

All of us believe that the ecumenical movement must be brought down from the level of the ecumenists to the level of the people. From the complex terminology used by theologians to the language understood by the faithful. From the pulpit to the pew of the believer. From the pages of ecumenical literature to the lips of the readers. Before our movement can become truly ecumenical it must not only be presented objectively but understood subjectively. In order to achieve this, however, we must make every effort to bring together the faithful of our member churches so that they may really know each other.

I do not intend to dwell at length upon all the reasons which make imperative the closer contact and fellowship that should be promoted among our faithful. I am quite confident, however, that with such a policy it would be possible

<sup>1</sup> Nicolas Zernov, "The Eastern Churches and the Ecumenical Movement in the Twentieth Century," in *A History of the Ecumenical Movement*, p. 673.



within a reasonable length of time to do away with whatever it is that holds us apart and, not infrequently, keeps us at odds. Once and for all we should dispel the notions still common among extreme non-Orthodox Christians that we Orthodox are superstitious, pagan-like worshippers dwelling in ignorance. At the same time we should help Orthodox zealots to understand that all the non-Orthodox are not dwelling either in darkness or in heresy or apart from Christ.

This closer contact of which I speak would perhaps assist the missionaries in the field so that they could better understand the proper direction in which they should channel more effectively their missionary activity. The Orthodox Church has frequently brought to the attention of our non-Orthodox friends the need for friendly contacts with her members. The church has also recommended to her faithful on many occasions that they should consider it a personal responsibility to become better acquainted with their non-Orthodox brethren and thus learn the meaning and history of their religious heritage.

In this instance, therefore, I wish to state that the Orthodox Church has contributed to the ecumenical movement a spirit of mutual acquaintance and respect which is most essential, if the ecumenical spirit is to spread and become a part of the conscience of our faithful.

We Orthodox have opened the doors of our churches to all other Christians. We have also opened our eyes, our hearts and our minds. We are eager to explain whatever is considered superstition. Not only the veneration of icons but also the deeper significance which is implied by the honor rendered to them. We are anxious to explain our seven sacraments, their biblical and theological basis, their actual role in our redemption. We are most willing to give any explanation requested about our Divine Liturgy and its symbolism; to clarify any part of doctrine expressed in the ritual or in the sacramental theology of the Liturgy; and to convey the effect of its spirituality and mysticism on the inner life of the faithful.

We are quite prepared to explain why we have icons and a perpetual vigil light in our homes, why we regard the family collected together as "a church in the house," why we observe periods of abstinence, why most of our people receive Holy Communion four times a year, why we especially honor the mother of our Lord and why we offer memorial services for the departed.

We are never reluctant to explain why we have separate prayers for infants on the eighth and fortieth day after their birth; why we prefer to give Christian names to our children; why we use incense, boiled wheat, and holy water; why we distribute small pieces of bread after Holy Communion and at the end of the service; why we wear special or ornate vestments during the Divine Liturgy and our other services; why we dress as we do; or why some of us have beards and long hair; and why we keep the Holy Bible on the family altar and read it by the light of the vigil lamp.

We are equally eager to learn why our non-Orthodox friends worship as they do, and we are prepared to recognize the reasons given for their basic



religious, ritualistic, theological or ecclesiological position. I personally believe that the time has come for us to approach each other with humility and respect, on the basis that we have much to learn from such experience, if we sincerely desire the ecumenical movement to become truly ecumenical.

In brief, that which the Orthodox Church has brought into the ecumenical movement to date and has been favored with the serious attention of sincere ecumenists, is basically her understanding of the ecumenical movement itself.

The Orthodox view of unity is well-known and does not need detailed explanation. The Eastern churches adhere to the belief that the real *unity* of the church was never and can never be broken, since she is "the body of Christ, the fulness of him" (Eph. 1:22-23).

What therefore, the Orthodox means when speaking of unity is not unity in the strict sense of the word, but rather "union" or "reunion." This has been stated by Orthodox theologians more than once at the ecumenical conferences, beginning with the Faith and Order conference at Lausanne (1927), and ending with that held in Oberlin (1957). In the first the Orthodox delegates jointly stated that "reunion can take place only on the basis of the common faith and confession of the ancient, undivided Church of the seven Ecumenical Councils and of the first eight centuries." In the last, the North American Faith and Order Study Conference, the particular statement read by Orthodox representatives was as follows:

The Orthodox Church teaches that the unity of the Church has not been lost, because she is the Body of Christ, and, as such, can never be divided. . . . We admit, of course, that the unity of Christendom has been disrupted, that the unity of Faith and the integrity of Order have been sorely broken, but we do not admit that the unity of the Church, and precisely of the "visible" and historical church, has ever been broken or lost, so as to be now a problem of search and discovery. The problem of unity is for us, therefore, the problem of the return to the fullness of Faith and Order, in full faithfulness to the message of Scripture and Tradition and in the obedience to the will of God "that all be one."<sup>2</sup>

The above quotations are sufficient enough to indicate beyond any doubt what the Orthodox view of "unity" is, and why, believing this, the Orthodox consider that the greatest service they can render to their Christian brethren at ecumenical conferences is to make their own position unmistakably clear by publishing separately their statement on the subjects under discussion.

In the question of sacred tradition the Orthodox Church again contributed a clear and concise statement of her understanding and teaching. For us, tradition does not come under the heading of church history. Tradition is a stream which flows through the church from the very beginning. We Orthodox hold that in its essence tradition cannot be understood in any way other than as the work of the Holy Spirit which guides the church unto the fulness of truth. Tradition, therefore, is the very life of the church, and all Christians would do well to examine the subject of tradition in the light of the Orthodox viewpoint.

<sup>2</sup> *The Nature of the Unity We Seek*, Ed. by Paul S. Minear (St. Louis: Bethany Press, 1958), p. 159 f.



The interpretation that we Christians give to the word "tradition" is quite erroneous. Moreover many of us make another unintentional mistake: we use the term "tradition" interchangeably with the term "traditions" and thus increase the existing confusion, since one never knows what we really intend to express with each of these two terms. I will not dwell on the theology of tradition itself, because I am afraid that we may find ourselves confronted with real and astounding conclusions.

I would recommend, therefore, a new historical and theological approach to the subject of tradition, if we wish to strengthen the ecumenical movement and not hinder its progress. Actually we do the latter when we speak in our ecumenical conferences about our own particular traditions which are not only different one from another but at times in conflicting opposition. Certainly the time has come for us to initiate a new ecumenical tradition in order that we may bear witness one day to the attainment of ecumenical unity through the ecumenical movement.

The final contribution to the ecumenical movement by the Orthodox Church is her particular understanding of the term ecumenical movement. Although we can readily find the reference in many other texts, I wish to call your attention to the encyclical letter that the present Ecumenical Patriarch Athenagoras addressed to the other jurisdictions of the Orthodox Church on February 6, 1952:

According to its own constitution, the World Council of Churches seeks only to facilitate common action by the churches, to promote cooperation in study in a Christian spirit, to strengthen ecumenical-mindedness among members of all Churches, to support an even wider spreading of the holy Gospel, and finally to preserve, uplift and generally restore spiritual values for mankind within the framework of common Christian standards. We can, therefore, unreservedly say that the principal aim of the World Council is essentially practical, and that its main task is one which is sanctioned by God. All in all, the World Council of Churches, as the outward expression of an inner noble wish that embraces the soul of Christendom, is an organization worthy of our full attention.

We of the Orthodox Church must participate in this pan-Christian movement because it is our duty to impart to our heterodox brethren the riches of our faith, worship, and order, and of our spiritual and ascetic experience. On the other hand we must inform ourselves of their new methods and their conceptions of church life and activity, things of great value, that the Orthodox Church could not appropriate or foster in the past on account of the particular conditions in which she lived. We believe therefore that the participation and cooperation of the Orthodox Church with the World Council of Churches in the future is both necessary and valuable.<sup>3</sup>

To the above we are now able to add the latest pronouncement of His All-Holiness in reference to the announcement by the Vatican of the proposed ecumenical council. The Patriarch has said, "No synod can be called ecumenical unless it is truly such, that is pan-Christian." His All-Holiness has said further that "if the Orthodox Church is invited, it will be represented only if the entire Christian world is invited to send representatives. The minimum representation of the other Churches would be their collective representation through the World Council of Churches."

<sup>3</sup> *Documents on Christian Unity, Fourth Series (1948-1957)*, Ed. by G. K. A. Bell (London: Oxford University Press, 1958), p. 39.



With this definition which coincides with the historical testimony of the ecumenical spirit of Orthodoxy, His Holiness delineates his faith in the ecumenical movement. For this reason the Spiritual Leader of Orthodox Christianity has always urged the various jurisdictions of our church to designate full and adequate representations. His Holiness truly wants to see adequate support given to the ecumenical movement. In an official statement issued two years ago on the occasion of the World Council of Churches' Central Committee meeting in New Haven, he stated that since the Orthodox Church believes in the ecumenical movement, it would not wish to see any weakening of its force. For this very same reason the Ecumenical Patriarchate is in favor of any means or measures that could give additional strength to the ecumenical movement. Furthermore, it has stated its position against anything which could eventually result in diminishing the prestige of the World Council of Churches.

The Orthodox Church's understanding of the ecumenical movement is, in my humble opinion, another contribution, however small, to the true universal character of the ecumenical movement.

I would like to emphasize that the Ecumenical Patriarchate is watching with profound interest the development of the ecumenical movement and wants to see it become strong enough to embrace all Christian churches throughout the world.

Of course we know the present trend of the movement and we are very pleased with its determination to move ahead. Recent mergers of different yet related confessions and churches here in America are furthering the hope for a gradual narrowing of the gap between the various traditional streams.

We are fully aware of the existing difficulties, but we most earnestly adhere to the solemn obligation to pray that our faith may be so strengthened as to remove all such difficulties. It is in this hope and prayer and in this deep conviction that the Orthodox Church participates in the ecumenical movement. Our Lord Jesus is still praying for us. May his will be done. "For he is our peace, who hath made both one, and hath broken down the middle wall of partition between us... and he came and preached peace to us which were afar off, and them that were nigh. For through him we both have access by one Spirit unto the Father" (Eph. 2:14, 17-18).



# Church, State and Society - An Orthodox View

HAMILCAR S. ALIVISATOS

**THE RELATION OF CHURCH**, state and society to one another constitutes one of the most complicated problems of the church's life.

The very first appearance of the church in the world, and its first contact with the organization of the Roman empire, indicate the difficulties implicit in the relationship that exists naturally between them.

As a matter of fact the problem itself appeared before the official foundation of the visible church on the day of Pentecost. The embarrassing question of the Pharisees and the Herodians—"Is it lawful to pay taxes to Caesar or not?"—and Jesus' answer—"Render... to Caesar the things that are Caesar's, and unto God the things that are God's" (Matt. 22:17)—put the problem squarely, and the course of history has only complicated it.

This complication arises quite naturally from a number of facts. (1) Church and state quite naturally influence each other. (2) Their endeavors are in some way correlated. (3) Each has quite a different conception of the authority it exercises over society and the individual. (4) Above all, up to now it has proved impossible to understand rightly the sphere of action common to both and the boundaries separating the two. The several stages of cultural enlightenment of human society in the course of history have greatly contributed to the complication of the problem.

## The State and Social Order

The question of the regulation of social order by the supreme state authority is the starting point of the trouble. There is no doubt that social order in this world is something willed by God. The permanence of human society composed of ephemeral individuals, as stated in Hebrews 13:10 and 14, indicates perhaps the right solution of the problem. Sin has of course afflicted and darkened human consciences and keeps man from conceiving clearly the goals of social order. On the other hand faith in the redemptive power of Jesus Christ leads him toward that goal.

The theory that the very foundation of political order is the result of a sinful action is not at all satisfactory, not only because all that God has created is good (Gen. 1:31), but also because "the powers that be are ordained of God" (Rom. 13:1) and those in power are the servants of God (13:4). Precisely this fact delivers us from the fear of "the higher powers" and obliges us "to do that which is good" (13:3), which in other words means that everyone "must be subject not only to avoid God's wrath but also for the sake of conscience" (13:5).

The purpose therefore of the existence of the state's authority is the maintenance of social order and the restoration of disorder created by sinful individuals.



Of course if each individual would freely apply in society the highest law and commandment of love, the state's interference could be avoided, because "love does no wrong to a neighbor" and "love is the fulfilling of the law" (Rom. 13:10). But just on this point we find ourselves in a vicious circle, because the state trying to rehabilitate, even by force, social order disturbed by sinful individuals is composed of sinful men. Precisely at this point comes the beneficial interference of the church. Deep feelings of individual responsibility for the good order in society, deriving from human conscience as expressed very often by laws, prove that this voice of God (the conscience) in human beings is not vainly heard by them. All Greek philosophers and poets, especially Plato, Aristotle, Euripides and Sophocles, acknowledge the derivation of social order (by laws) directly from God, who thus speaks in the hearts of men.

The church through its special pastoral care provides the state with Christian individuals who shoulder fully their responsibility for the application of God's law and thus bear testimony of God's voice in human society.

Social order if regulated (as St. Paul says) by love demonstrates the superb harmony of God's will and human action, which is the ideal fulfillment of God's will on earth.

But before examining the problem more closely a brief look at the historical background may help us to approach it with better understanding.

### The Wedding of Church and State

The Roman state took an inimical attitude towards the Christian religion from its very first appearance. Regardless of what Christians and the Christian church were in reality, in Roman eyes they were both illegal, first because they represented an illegal religion (*religio illicita*) not mentioned in the list of *religiones licitae*, and, second, because by refusing to recognize the emperor's deity, Christians made themselves guilty of the crime against the emperor's majesty (*majestas imperatoris*). The prescribed penalty for both crimes was death, and martyrdom before the final execution may be considered a lenient (*sic!*) effort of the state authorities to deliver the guilty Christians from death by securing their eventual repentance.

The Christian church had to face a totalitarian state order, which considered religion a natural part of its framework, as a matter of pure and simple public order.

Constantine the Great (d. 337) recognized the Christian religion first as a *religio licita* and then as the state religion. He took vis-à-vis the church the same position he had in the heathen religion. While for the latter he was *pontifex maximus*, he took for the former—even though he was not yet a full Christian—the title of bishop of external church affairs (*episkopos tōn ektos*). This conferred on him the right to interfere very energetically even in doctrinal questions! The



church never protested against such interferences. On the contrary, she recognized the emperor as the "faithful King" (*pistos basileus*) and as the "annointed of the Lord" (*chrestos kyriou*) and this not only tacitly, but also by special canons acknowledging the emperor's authority over the church.

Thus little by little the peculiar system of relations between church and state, known as Caesaropapism, was created and developed without being even questioned by the church. Even the church canons were affirmed by imperial laws, and this established order was regarded as well-pleasing to God. The only explanation of this phenomenon is that some of the leading bishops, such as the bishops of Rome and Constantinople, tolerated this extraordinary development not only out of sheer respect to the emperor, but also on account of their deep obligation to him for extending official recognition to the church and for the many privileges he had bestowed upon them. The church was even flattered by this situation, which made evident its full victory over heathen religion and the latter's expulsion from its official position, which the church now occupied. It is clear that the emperor's recognition of the state and the privileges he bestowed find, from the strict canonical and doctrinal point of view, no justification whatever. The emperor became the ruler of church affairs and his unprotested interferences were beneficial or disastrous for the church, depending on whether his religious temperament was strong and deep or weak and shallow.

Caesaropapism is usually ascribed to the Eastern (Byzantine) church, but this is not entirely correct. As I have recently shown (in my communication to last year's congress of comparative law in Brussels), this policy was exercised by the emperors *equally*, both in the Eastern and the Western church; neither the Pope nor the Bishop of Constantinople nor any synod ever protested against it and it has survived up to now even in many Protestant churches of Western Europe.

When the Slavs accepted Eastern Christianity, they preserved Caesaropapism in its severest form. Peter the Great in his many interferences not only changed the church's administrative system (by abolishing the Moscow Patriarchate and by creating the uncanonical synod as the head of the Russian church) but also imposed on the church even Protestant regulations, entirely unknown to the canon law of the Orthodox church. Here again the latter has never raised the slightest protest against such unbelievable actions, but has accepted them, thus creating a status quo that lasted for centuries. The imposed system was even copied by some other Orthodox churches (such as the Church of Greece) as genuinely Orthodox (!) on the grounds that it had been in use for a very long time by the numerically largest church in Orthodoxy, the Russian church.

Certain later historical developments in the West led the church there to a misconception of its position and its mission in the world and to a full misunderstanding of its spiritual power. The great privileges bestowed on the church meant placing in the hands of bishops and particularly of the Bishop of Rome a tremendous power, which little by little took on worldly character, affirmed even by a spurious document (the famous *Donatio Constantini*) altogether contrary



to Christ's commandments for the church. It is a curious historical fact that when the falsification came to light, it was too late for the abolishment of the authority gained by the same!

These parallel developments in East and West have never moved the church to take action against the order thus created, an order which has surely caused great harm to the church and created great disorder in Christian society. These developments have also been chiefly responsible for the great schism of the 9th and 11th centuries which has been so disastrous for the church up to the present day.

Although the boundaries between church, state and society are very distinct, all these historical developments have contributed greatly to the complication of the relationship of the three to one another.

### **The Church and the Modern State**

The a-religious state of modern times presents perhaps a wise way out of the perplexity, if this state is entirely honest. The church has nothing to do with political affairs and the state regards religion and church affairs as a kind of private business in which it has no interest whatever. Religion is therefore absolutely free and there is no interference by the state in its institutional forms (the churches). It is only when public order is disturbed by religion and the church that the state makes its presence felt; but even then the state has no reason for any other interference and no reason to fear the church's rendering to God what is God's. If the state oversteps the bounds of its authority and insists on interfering in the *interna corporis* of the church, then there is no question as to the church's policy. In such a case the axiom "obey God rather than men" (Acts 5:29) applies, even if this should involve martyrdom (5:40-41), and the church's situation and position is more than clear. This was the policy of the apostolic and of the ancient church, and hundreds of thousands of real Christian individuals gave their life for Christ defending the right order in Christian society as created by Christ. On the other hand the democratic spirit of the Orthodox church, deriving from the equality of all its members (Matt. 18:20 and 23:11) in contrast to the Roman Catholic conception of the monarchical system, based on a misinterpretation of Matt. 16:18, is an undoubted guarantee of the upholding of genuinely Christian order in society.

### **The Orthodox Church and Totalitarian Government**

That this is all not sheer theory but real facts is demonstrated by the later history of the Orthodox church. The Orthodox church both in ancient and modern times has had the privilege of bearing splendid testimony, in humble pride, of the real conception of Christian life in society and vis-à-vis its obligations to the state as outlined by our Lord.



No other Christian church has lived under such trying political circumstances as the Orthodox church. For over 400 years nearly all Orthodox nations (except Russia) were under the most hideous and barbarous Turkish yoke.

During this period the Orthodox church struggled for its life against the totalitarian Turkish state and produced hundreds of thousands of new martyrs of the Christian faith.

Some very superficial remarks on the dreadful experience of the Orthodox church during that period would have it that the Orthodox church was, by reason of its policy toward the state, simply involved in political affairs. Its close relationship with national life is cited in support of this view. But apart from the fact that the conquering of a nation by force is not a simple political affair, and that the protection of a nation living under the yoke of oppression is one of the most sacred duties of the church, it must never be forgotten that the chief reason for the conquest of the Turks (and also of the communists) was the persecution and annihilation of the Christian faith. Under such circumstances the martyrdom that was suffered retains its full religious value, even if the national character of that martyrdom makes it at the same time national heroism. It is very significant that in their struggle against the Turks, Greece and the other Orthodox nations were certain that they were fighting for their country and at the same time for the holy faith of Christ. These nations would not have been Christian nations anymore if they had not struggled for their faith also. Even the ordinary social life of the Orthodox peoples in Turkey during short peaceful intervals shows clearly the influence of the church on the life of society.

It is well known that the prevailing of certain materialistic theories in recent years, mostly in Orthodox countries and especially in Russia, has forced the Russian church and the churches of other Orthodox nations to accept the challenge of the godless totalitarian state, and in circumstances almost similar to those of the ancient church—if not worse—to follow the same policy it did, trying in humble obedience through martyrdom, as St. Paul warns, “to redeem the time because the days are evil” (Eph. 5:16).

There is no doubt that by a sincere cooperation of church and state a new and godpleasing situation can be created for the benefit of the church, the state and society. Each of them can truly contribute to, and profit by, a harmonious society inspired by the highest law of God’s love, which cannot but influence even the most godless state.



# The Greek Version of the Augsburg Confession

GEORGES FLOROVSKY

THE FIRST GREEK TRANSLATION of the Augsburg Confession was published in 1559 in Basel. This edition included only the Greek text. The name of the translator was given on the title page: *Graece reddita a Paulo Dolscio Plauensi*. Dolscius also wrote the preface to the translation, in Latin. In 1584 the text of Dolscius was reprinted in the famous volume *Acta et Scripta Theologorum Wirtembergensium*, which was a complete report on the correspondence between a group of Lutheran theologians in Tübingen and the Patriarch Jeremias II of Constantinople.<sup>1</sup> This time the Latin text was also given, in parallel column, with the Greek.

This first edition had apparently a limited circulation, or only few copies were published. Already in 1574 Martin Crusius had difficulty in obtaining a copy.<sup>2</sup> It does not seem that the book was widely read in Western Europe. Indeed, the peculiar character of the Dolscius' edition escaped attention of scholars. Professor Ernst Benz of Marburg was the first to call attention to this curious document.<sup>3</sup> Little can be added to his able analysis, although of course he did not solve definitively all the problems which the document raises. In this brief essay I can but review his findings.

First of all, the authorship of the translation is uncertain and obscure. Paul Dolscius was a competent Greek scholar and a convinced humanist. In his preface to the translation he emphasized the importance of the biblical languages for an adequate understanding of the Christian faith. The preface was dedicated to a certain Dr. Melchior Kling, a renowned jurist of that time. Dolscius suggested that the stimulus for the translation was given by Dr. Kling. Now, it seems that all this is a disguise, if not a deliberate mystification. Dolscius also insisted on the strict accuracy of his translation: *nihil de suo addens*. But in fact the Greek translation deviates widely from the original. There are strong reasons for believing that the actual initiative belonged to no lesser than Melanchthon. Already Crusius was aware of this fact: *nomine Dolscii editum, sed a Philippo compositum*.<sup>4</sup> In any case, in the very year of the first publication of the Greek version, Melanchthon forwarded his copy to the then Patriarch of Constantinople, Joasaph, with a covering letter in which he suggested that

<sup>1</sup> A German translation of this important correspondence has recently been published: *Wort und Mystrium* (Witten/Ruhr: Luther-Verlag, 1958) [reviewed in *Lutheran World*, June, 1959, p. 90 f. Editor]; cf. my article, "An Early Ecumenical Correspondence," in *World Lutheranism of Today* (1950), pp. 98-111.

<sup>2</sup> *Turcograecia*, Tübingen, 1584, p. 488. Prof. Benz was able to locate copies of this edition in Tübingen, Stuttgart and Wittenberg. I had at my disposal, on microfilm, the copy of the library of Leipzig University. The Leipzig copy differs, however, from those known to Benz: he indicates the number of pages as 73 in 8vo; the Leipzig copy has 113.

<sup>3</sup> Ernst Benz, "Die griechische Übersetzung der Confessio Augustana aus dem Jahre 1559," in *Kyrios*, Vol. V, No. 1/2, 1940-1941, pp. 25-65; reprinted in *Wittenberg und Byzanz: Zur Begegnung und Auseinandersetzung der Reformation und der östlich-orthodoxen Kirche* (Marburg/Lahn: Elwert-Gräfe und Unzer Verlag, 1949), pp. 94-128.

<sup>4</sup> *Turcograecia*, p. 264.



the Lutheran movement was close to Orthodoxy. The letter apparently was never delivered. In the light of this overture to the East, the peculiar character of the Greek version becomes comprehensible: it was intended primarily for the Greeks. No free circulation in the West was anticipated. Melanchthon's keen interest in the Greek church is well known, and it dates from his early years. In the fifties he had various links with Greek visitors to Germany. One of them, Demetrius, even stayed with him during those years.<sup>5</sup> Demetrius probably also participated in the translation. The role of Dolscius, on the other hand, is quite obscure.

Secondly, the text of the confession used for the translation was peculiar. It was not the official text of 1530. The Latin text included in *Acta et Scripta* is similar to the *Variata* of 1531, but differs even from it. Professor Benz aptly describes it as Melanchthon's *Variatissima*. It remains to situate it accurately in relation to all of Melanchthon's other drafts of the confession. In his study Benz offers but few hints in this direction. Strangely enough, the editors of *Acta et Scripta* did not mention at all that the Latin text in their edition was a very special version of the Augsburg Confession. The problem is too technical to be discussed in this essay, however.

Thirdly, the Greek translation of 1559 widely differs also from this peculiar Latin text. It was more an adaptation than a translation. A detailed analysis is outside the scope of this essay. Such an analysis would require a thorough examination of various theological terms, both in Latin and Greek. On the whole, Professor Benz is right in suggesting that the translators deliberately toned down the forensic or juridical tenor of the Augustana doctrine of redemption. Indeed, at many points the translators could not easily find in current Greek theological vocabulary exact equivalents of Latin terms. Insofar inaccuracy of rendering was almost inevitable. But there was much more than that. There was an obvious desire to adjust the exposition to the traditional convictions of the Greek church. As Benz has suggested, the whole exposition is transposed from the dimension of the *Rechtfertigungsreligion* into the dimension of the *Erlösungsreligion*. Instead of the concept of justification, the dominant idea of the Greek version is that of healing.

The question then arises, To what extent was this Greek interpretation of the confession congenial to the original intent of the Augustana? Indeed, the Greek version of 1559 was the only text of the Augsburg Confession which was put at the disposal of Greek authorities and theologians, when the group of Tübingen theologians approached the Patriarch of Constantinople in 1574 with the request to study and evaluate their doctrinal position. The patriarch was not informed about the actual status of the text submitted for his examination. What was behind this move?

<sup>5</sup> See E. Benz, "Melanchthon und der Serbe Demetrios," in *Kyrios*, Vol. IV, No. 3/4, 1939-1940, pp. 222-261, and in *Wittenberg und Byzanz*, pp. 59-93.



It is quite possible that Martin Crusius and his friends sent to Constantinople the version of 1559 simply because this was the only existing Greek text. It is interesting, however, that a second edition of this version appeared again in 1587, in Wittenberg—again, the Greek text only. For whom was this new edition intended? I have not examined this second edition personally. But it is obviously strange that it was issued after the final authorization of the main text of 1530 by its inclusion in the Book of Concord. It does not seem that this new edition was intended for Greek readers. The patriarch's unfavorable response sorely discouraged any new negotiations between Lutherans and Orthodox. The strangest thing is (and this was not mentioned explicitly by Professor Benz) that the peculiarity of the Greek version was overlooked also by the Roman Catholic polemicists of the time, who could have exploited this fact for their own purposes—to estrange the Orthodox from the Lutherans. True, the original edition of 1559 may have been rare, but the same text was reprinted in *Acta et Scripta*. It is not excluded, however, that the Tübingen theologians were prepared to commit themselves to that particular interpretation of the Augsburg Confession which was embodied in the Greek version. Some further inquiry will be needed before an adequate answer can be given.

In any case, the Greek version of the Augustana was a significant theological experiment. One may ask in conclusion to what extent the main doctrines of the Augsburg Confession can be adequately expressed in the categories of the Greek patristic (and liturgical) tradition? In our day, of course, this question has not the same meaning as in the days of Melanchthon or of Martin Crusius.



# FROM THE WORK OF THE LUTHERAN WORLD FEDERATION AND THE ECUMENICAL WORLD

## GENEVA DIARY

*On behalf of the Lutheran World Federation, we are very pleased to dedicate this issue of the Lutheran World to the past president of the LWF, Landesbischof Dr. Hanns Lilje of Hannover. We are happy to join his many friends around the world in paying him tribute on the occasion of his 60th birthday on August 20, 1959. We do so with deep gratitude for his effective leadership during a very important period of the history of the LWF and for his constant interest in the federation, his dedication to it and unfailing support of it, both before the formation of the federation, in the days of the Lutheran World Convention, and since its formation in 1947.*

*One can recall with interest the fact that Bishop Lilje served as secretary of the Executive Committee of the Lutheran World Convention beginning in 1936, when his bishop A. Mahrrens was the president. Thus Bishop Lilje has served world Lutheranism for a longer continuous period than any other person in our work at the present time. Since the formation of the federation in 1947 he has a record of uninterrupted service, first as a member of the Executive Committee, then as president from 1952 to 1957, and now once again as a very important member of the Executive Committee. It is useless, and hopeless, to attempt in this brief summary a complete evaluation of what his leadership has meant to the LWF as such and to our member churches during this period. We do recount with gratitude and pleasure his contribution, during these more than two decades of work, to the causes of the Lutheran churches of the world. We are especially grateful that as the Bishop of the Hannover Landeskirche and now more recently as chairman of the German National Committee and presiding bishop of the United Lutheran Church in Germany, he has established a bridge between that very important sector of world Lutheranism in Germany and the many other sections of Lutheranism in all other parts of the world. Bishop Lilje has been admirably successful in interpreting to those outside Germany, in Asia, Africa, Latin America and not least North America and other parts of Europe, the special place of theology and the life of his own church. Particularly because of his linguistic ability and his wide travels before entering the office of the presidency, as well as for other reasons, he has been able to communicate the deepest insights on an international level in a most unique and fruitful fashion. Our federation will always be indebted to our friend for the many arduous trips undertaken in his office as president of*



the LWF and for the excellent way in which our churches unanimously responded to his message and his interpretation.

On his 60th birthday we are mindful of the many interesting ways in which he has been able to reach the minds and hearts of youth and of the aged, of students and the laity, of pastors and theologians. I can recall one special experience in North America at the Minneapolis Assembly of the LWF in 1957, when Bishop Lilje had finished his address to a rally of thousands of young people on a beautiful summer evening. Someone asked me, quite aptly, "Is there any other man in world Lutheranism who could fill the role of 'world evangelist' better than Bishop Lilje?" Thinking about this question I would reply with a distinct negative. "World evangelist," in the best sense of the term, is the term I believe characterizes best Bishop Lilje's help and his work with the LWF in the years that I have been associated with him. It seems to me that there is a unanimous verdict that as president of the LWF Bishop Lilje symbolized the voice of world Lutheranism; he was able in a very excellent sense to communicate the voice of the church wherever he has traveled and before whatever groups he appeared. As one who worked with him very closely during these years it is with a sense of gratitude and satisfaction that I look back on the privilege of being able to cooperate with him and work under his leadership. The federation has been uniquely blessed through his activities, his writings and his speeches.

Much more could be written in tribute to Bishop Lilje in the role he has played as a leader and president of the LWF, but we shall only express again our gratitude to God for the blessing he has granted to the federation in permitting Bishop Lilje to offer himself so freely and completely to the task that was placed upon him.

### Stewardship Developments

Readers of the Lutheran World will have noted a special report in the June 1959 issue on a stewardship conference held in Hoisbüttel, Germany, in April. I have just returned from a brief meeting of representatives of the Commission on Stewardship and Congregational Life held in Strasbourg in late June. The members of this smaller committee heard with great interest and joy the report by the stewardship secretary, Pastor Richard Nelson, over one and a half years of work in this new post created by the Commission on World Service in cooperation with the Commission on Stewardship and Congregational Life. His report, together with the results of the Hoisbüttel meeting, indicate that what happened at the Hannover Assembly in 1952 is slowly beginning to bear fruit. One recalls with interest what was said by the Norwegian representatives to the Hannover Assembly, that the one word and the one new idea that characterized that assembly was "stewardship"; and one may say with thankfulness that in a number of churches this concept, and to a degree its practice, has slowly been taking root and is producing interesting and positive results. One dare not use such exaggerated terms as "revival" or "renewal," but one can speak of interest, and of attempts to apply in local situations



*what was once considered a totally American development. Through the sharing of experiences there has been a healthy development which bodes well for the future in our family of churches.*

*It is the hope of this commission and of the Department of World Service that a genuine exchange of younger church leaders, both pastors and laity, in this field and many other fields, will bear fruit on all continents; that it will help the churches through the essential and vital work of the congregation and its place in the life of the community. One can point with satisfaction to the fact that more and more churches are asking for the counsel of the office of stewardship in Geneva and that more and more attention is being given in various places within the church to the development of stewardship in their total church life. These developments one can only greet with joy and satisfaction, and hope that such an exchange of experiences will be encouraged and developed further.*

CARL E. LUND-QUIST



## Committee on Latin America

### Not More Religion, but a Dynamic Faith

CONFERENCES AND CONVENTIONS of the church are remembered to the extent that they achieve a "break-through" from the past to the future. It is too soon to evaluate the extent of the "break-through" achieved by the Third Latin American Lutheran Conference at Buenos Aires in April, 1959, but there are at least two points at which some progress—small or large—may reasonably be expected.

First of all, let us put the Buenos Aires meeting in its proper context. It had been preceded by two other conferences at Curitiba in 1951 and at Petropolis in 1954, as well as by an informal consultation at Dubuque, Iowa, in 1957 after the Minneapolis LWF Assembly. It may be said that all three of these meetings served primarily to make Lutherans better acquainted with one another. Geographical distances, ethnic traditions and linguistic barriers had to be surmounted.

At Curitiba the major "break-through" was out of extreme isolation into contact. At Petropolis, a few years later, it was the decision to launch a new seminary to serve the Spanish-speaking area (now established at José C. Paz near Buenos Aires) and the determination to proceed with a new Spanish hymnal and service book (scheduled for publication in 1960). It was not the intention at Dubuque to adopt resolutions, but there was general agreement that the period of "getting acquainted" had passed and the time for a broader consideration of the future task had arrived.

This common task was understood to be the more effective preaching of the gospel in Latin America. Or, in the words of a former missionary to Peru, "what Latin America needs is not more religion but a dynamic faith" (Stanley Rycroft, *Religion in Latin America*). This sentence was not aimed at Lutherans but it pricks our conscience with particular force, firstly, because we are probably the largest Protestant denomination in Latin America, secondly, because our evangelical zeal remained strangely muted, even muzzled, thirdly, because of our uneasy feeling that in muting our witness we are less than loyal to the "one, holy, catholic and apostolic church." Let it be added imme-

diately that these considerations are not meant to refer only to the 900,000 Lutherans in Latin America but to the vast majority of our 70 million member fellowship.

Naturally the problem of a more effective witness cannot be solved by conference resolutions. If it were otherwise, mankind would long since have been returned to paradise. But the program of the Buenos Aires meeting was designed to enable each church body and congregation, each pastor and layman, to see his part of the common task more clearly. A brief review of the major addresses will help to put the possible points of "break-through" in their proper perspective.

The first day's theme was "The Universal Gospel." In the unavoidable absence of LWF President Fry, Dr. Paul C. Empie (Executive Director of the National Lutheran Council, USA) gave the opening address under the title "Mission, Confession and Unity." His main point was that these three values must be kept in constant balance:

A confessional approach to unity on the one hand asserts the necessity of protecting the purity and power of the word and brings to the ecumenical discussion its own conviction of truth, but is prepared on the other hand to let the Holy Spirit work through the word to overrule the diversities of interpretation. Convictions are the things men live by, but the fear to test them in conversations with those of differing convictions casts doubt upon their truth and validity.

Furthermore, a Christian's witness must be active:

Thus our mission, although it must include a pure exposition of the gospel combined with a search for unity, may be fruitless unless our passion for obedience matches our zeal for correct doctrine.

The second day's theme, "The Fullness of Time," was developed first in a historical treatise by Rector Béla Leskó of the José C. Paz Facultad Luterana de Teología, and then in a thought-provoking paper on the importance of the evangelical witness in Latin America by Dr. Fernandez-Arlt, of the YMCA's spiritual training program.

Dr. Leskó described the Reformation not only as a historical fact but as a perennial possibility.

One aspect of the Reformation we wish to emphasize is this: its extension... through students, merchants, pamphlets



and books in the language of the people. . . . It is our duty to find a characteristic form for the Lutheran church in Latin America. That is the true realization and continuation of the Reformation. . . . The basis of this development is the creation of a Latin American Reformation theology.

### Move with the City

On the fourth day the basic theme was "The High Calling." This was approached both from the standpoint of the Christian layman and from that of the ordained minister. New insights were brought to "The Horizons of Christian Vocation" by President Adolf Wischmann of the German Evangelical Church's Foreign Office from his rich experience as the former head of the Evangelical Academy at Loccum.

The church must find new means and methods to get next to the modern population-mass. This involves a deliberate dismemberment of the parish, a division of the congregation into natural working units. Only in this way can all the areas of life in which the parish lives be reached. . . . The pastor cannot know everything, but must use lay help in much greater measure. . . . Synods and congregations that come from the old European tradition are in special danger of persisting in old traditions. . . . Churches must move with the building plans of cities, not limp along 20 or 50 years later. Decentralize the work in big city parishes. . . .

Dean Ragnar Askmark of the Göteborg Cathedral, Sweden, inspired a sense of rededication in his presentation of the ministry as "sanctified service."

What in us is it that should give the word which we speak its strength? This is a personal question to us which touches our sanctification, and we should not shake it off. . . . Holiness is not vested in the minister but in the ministry; indeed, it is not even invested in the ministry but is inherent in the word. . . . What then does sanctified service mean? . . . To be in sanctified service means to let the word do with you what it wants. . . . In all our service, every day, we begin with God's mercy, we continue with God's mercy, and we end with this mercy. To place ourselves as pastors under this mercy, that means holy service in a sanctified office.

The final day was devoted to closing discussions without further discourse but it was under the theme "That All May be One." Incidentally, each day began with matins and a brief meditation on the themes, and Friday was no exception. A spirit of true unanimity prevailed as the brief resolutions were presented for debate. Nothing ambitious was to be attempted, no sweeping proclamations were to be issued. Most of the participants obviously preferred to restrict the "findings" of this free conference to a realistic minimum. These grew out of two or three brief reports previously submitted.

### Toward National Lutheran Councils

The first and most significant resolution gathered up the frequently expressed concern for greater unity of purpose.

The conference expresses its conviction that there should be closer contact between Lutheran bodies on a territorial basis and recommends that the initiative be taken by synods, missions and congregations *to establish in each country a common agency—perhaps a national council—as a free channel of communication, consultation and cooperation.* Fields of activity might include press and publicity, promotion of Christian literature, new methods of lay work (especially the Evangelical Academy), and a regular exchange of views with respect to church policy and the planning of new work. It is further suggested that definite people be appointed for specific tasks with a view to maintaining contact with other national councils.

When the diversity of synods and agencies represented at the conference is fully considered—e.g. bodies of German origin, Scandinavian seamen's missions, North American mission fields, and multilingual congregations—the far-reaching implications of this recommendation becomes startlingly clear, even when the fact is noted that some participants regarded themselves as official visitors and therefore refrained from voting. This was true, for example, of the men from the Missouri Synod who nevertheless read a communication at the close of the session expressing their satisfaction with the conference and their desire to participate in further fellowship.

At first sight it might seem as though this Resolution on Cooperation could be applied only in one or two countries; if taken seri-



ously, however, it could result in a sort of "united front" for two or more Lutheran groups in almost every South American country. With the sole exception of Argentina, where a national committee exists, the possibilities of systematic Lutheran cooperation remain practically unexplored. Perhaps this is the "break-through" for which the Buenos Aires Conference will be noted.

### In and with Latin America

Two other resolutions have an innocent appearance but contain a certain amount of dynamite, when their background is better known. (The fourth and last resolution, by the way, simply recommended the holding of a Fourth Conference in 1965 as well as other interim meetings.) The attitude reflected by both speakers and participants was not only that Martin Luther's great-grandchildren should band themselves more closely together *in* Latin America but that the Lutheran church should endeavor to identify itself *with* Latin America and find its place in the Latin American environment. What the Resolution on Theological Courses said was this:

The conference warmly supports the suggestion that theological seminaries consider the desirability of offering refresher courses and postgraduate work to pastors and others, for example, in the form of summer institutes under special leaders. It is further suggested that two or more Lutheran seminaries may wish to cooperate in working out such programs.

What Professor Keller of Concordia Seminary in Buenos Aires proposed in his barbed document on "Advanced Study" went considerably farther. He started from the fact that the younger churches were grateful for what they had received but they now craved "technical knowledge" even more than "economic subsidy" in order to find their way from narrow provincialism into the ecumenical and universal. He questioned the policy of offering study abroad in order solely to strengthen denominational ties and suggested the promotion of graduate work in Latin America to get away from adapting "foreign" solutions to local situations. "I believe that one of the best contributions which the established churches can make for the Lutheran churches of Latin America is seriously to challenge them to unite in complete obedience to the word of God and on the basis

of that word to produce their own solutions...."

This healthy yearning found an echo in the Resolution on Exchange Program introduced by President Gottschald of the Synod of Rio Grande do Sul in Brazil. It not only requested an intensification of the visitation program but gave first priority to an interchange within Latin America, specifying that this should include representative laymen interested in various aspects of church work. As for foreign visitors, it was suggested that return visits by some of those who had previously become acquainted with Latin America might be arranged rather than sending new persons.

This, then, sums up what might be called the tangible "results" of the Buenos Aires Conference. There were no resounding resolutions on world peace, disarmament, or nuclear warfare—or even the persecution of Protestants in Colombia—although the subjects were mentioned. This indicates no desire to impugn church assemblies which speak out on these subjects, but it was simply agreed that it would be presumptuous for this small conference which meets for a few days every few years to attempt to make statements which could possibly be effective.

Those who attended—approximately 100 participants—seemed to be in unanimous agreement that the Lutheran church in Latin America had taken another small step forward. The largest delegation came from the Evangelical Church of the Lutheran Confession in Brazil and its four constituent synods, headed by President Schlieper and three other synodical presidents. Argentina's three bodies—La Plata Synod, the Iglesia Evangélica Luterana Unida, and the Iglesia Evangélica Luterana Argentina (Missouri)—as well as the four seamen's missions were well represented. So was the Chile synod. Other countries included Uruguay, Paraguay, Bolivia, Peru, Ecuador, Colombia and Venezuela with one or usually more persons. Bad weather stranded some people who failed to reach Buenos Aires in time.

It would take too much time and space to enter into a full description of the special services and the other events that filled up the entire week, but much credit is due to the local committee on arrangements for the preparations which were made and for the public attention which the conference received, especially in the metropolitan newspapers.

STEWART W. HERMAN



## Conference of European Churches

### Nyborg Neighbor

LEIBNIZ AT ONE TIME believed it possible to establish a "cultural harmony" of Europe on the basis of his monad conception, and a century later Novalis was still captivated by the dream of a "unity of the Christian West." Today both ideas have lost their luster. Our generation is more inclined toward critical diagnoses of Europe. We can no longer retrace our steps. The gifted writer Felix Hartlaub, who died while still a young man, complained once to the journal he kept during student days that he was an "unhoused European": "Search for a room, a primeval situation. No stay, no real roots, no reserve resources." After the war not only the "green heart of Germany" (Thuringia) but the center of Europe as well was cleft in two. Between East and West yawns a breach, bridged only here and there, if necessary by an airlift. The political and economic integration of West Europe has met with a certain amount of success, but it is not free of crises. The situation of our continent can be summarized in three brief sentences. (1) Europeans want to live, therefore they must trade with one another. (2) Europeans want peace, but the failure to reunite Germany makes the present peace uneasy. (3) Europeans want to believe, as their fathers did, but know not in what to believe; for the European of today neither the past nor the future is substantial enough in content to provide the basis of a new faith.

### A Regional Concern

This situation cannot be ignored by the churches of Europe, which want to serve the Europeans on the basis of the gospel. It is precisely when they have understood the course of ecumenical integration in the last decades—from churches' standing together to growing together to working together—that they are confronted with the question of making ecumenical thought and action concrete, on the *regional* level. With all due respect to their faculty for seeing things in terms of the whole, perhaps Christians have occasionally made the mistake of working too much on a global scale. In the long run the worldwide church becomes credible only

when it proves itself in work, on a large and small scale, at the regional level. In any case, the ecumenical movement in Europe in its concern for its neighbor in the "Far" East must not forget the neighbor on its own doorstep.

The European neighbor of the churches of Europe lies at their feet, like the man who fell among thieves on his way to Jericho. He can be "defined" as little as "neighbor" could be defined for the scribes. Love requires a kind of ec-stasy, a standing outside oneself, an extraordinary decision—precisely what the European of today, definition hungry and hostile to attempts to involve him, would like to avoid at all costs. Love for one's neighbor cannot be organizationally planned, however. One's neighbor always appears without warning, in time and space. He need not be an inhabitant of one's own European country; he can be elsewhere in Europe and still need my help. The story of the Good Samaritan and his "unconditioned" love shows that love for one's neighbor is not a task that can be duly performed and then forgotten; love is each time a response to Christ's call to care for his own. Today, more than ever, the European churches see their "neighbor," from the world and from within Christendom, standing before them, waiting skeptically but at the same time longing for help. Our neighbor from the world asks, "What do you have to offer us in our dividedness, our over-organization and rootlessness?" And from a neighboring church comes the question, "Do we not bear special responsibility, in the form of ecumenical pastoral care, for our uneasy continent? In the heritage of our churches do we not have a special and mutual contribution to make to Christendom the world over? Should we not therefore work together?"

At their recent meeting in Nyborg, the churches of Europe rediscovered their European neighbor, whom one might very well term their "Nyborg neighbor." I say rediscovered because there have of course always been certain contacts between the churches of Europe. In fact after the Life and Work conference in Stockholm in 1925 a European section functioned for years. That was only a first, groping attempt, however. The situation after 1945 confronted Christians in Europe with totally new problems. Europe had taken on new and rather intricate contours. The World Alliance of YMCA's took steps to meet this situation by attempting to



establish contact with the younger generation of Europe. In 1949 the YMCA's European Area Committee was established in Florence; it consolidated its ministry in the large European conferences held in Kassel in 1953 and in Aarhus in 1957.

The decisive hour for the churches of Europe came at the beginning of this year. On January 6-9, after long and toilsome preparation, a Conference of European Churches was held for the first time. Enough time has now elapsed to allow one to view the conference with some perspective. In what follows we shall first attempt to give some general impressions of the conference itself; then in the light of the conference we shall consider a few points in a possible future program of ecumenical study and action in Europe.

## I

Prior to Nyborg individual representatives of various churches had made preliminary contacts at the Conference of European Churches in Liselund, Denmark, in May, 1957. Valuable as was this first encounter, it was not official and its basis was too restricted. This was remedied by the work of the Planning Committee for the Nyborg conference, composed of Dr. Egbert Emmen, general secretary of the Reformed Church of the Netherlands; Jan Kiivit, archbishop of the Lutheran church in Estonia; and Dr. Hanns Lilje, bishop of the Lutheran Church of Hanover. Thus it came about that the whole-hearted cooperation of European Lutherans was obtained, and the participation of Eastern churches which do not belong to the World Council of Churches was made possible, since the Conference of European Churches works in close contact with the WCC but is completely separate from it organizationally.

The underlying problems and tensions became evident nonetheless in the composition of some of the delegations. Hungary sent church leaders who had assumed office after the suppression of the revolution. Some Scandinavian churches sent only delegates who were not church leaders. Apart from the general secretary of the British Council of Churches, Great Britain too sent only a kind of "exploratory" delegation. The Church of Scotland was not represented. The difficulties in Nyborg were similar to those encountered in the formation of the YMCA's European Area Committee. There too Britain

demonstrated a rather cautious attitude and that of some of the Nordic representatives was "wait and see."

## Conference Characteristics

The Nyborg conference was a conference of churches. Churches sent their official leaders and one could sense from the atmosphere that special importance attached to this kind of European organization of churches. Even where struggle with ideological systems has reduced the size of some of the European churches, or where there is some question about their character as folk churches, these churches are today still much in the public eye. Rarely have the press and radio taken so much notice of an ecumenical gathering as they did at Nyborg.

The significance of the conference for the public was heightened by the fact that the East also took part, being officially and, with the technical exception of Rumania, fully represented. Even the Moscow Patriarchate sent the deputy rector of the theological academy in Leningrad, Prof. Leo Parisski. Interestingly, Prof. Parisski declared that the Russian Orthodox church looks upon itself as a "European" church. The Lutheran churches of Latvia and Estonia, in the Soviet Union, were also represented. As has already been mentioned, Archbishop Kiivit of the Estonian church, truly an outstanding personality, played a dominant role. One must consider the full significance of the fact that the official representatives of the Western Churches sat around the same table with church leaders from Poland, Czechoslovakia, Bulgaria, the Soviet Union and Yugoslavia. A new element in this gathering was the presence of a strong delegation from the Orthodox church; while that is nothing unusual in ecumenical work, in Europe it undoubtedly raises new problems. One might even say that the conversation begun in the Post-Reformation era between Orthodoxy and German Protestants is now being resumed, 400 years later, in a quite different world.

Regular attendants at ecumenical conferences were astounded that the official language at Nyborg had to be "German," simply because the churches from the East were best able to make themselves understood in that language. Another reason may have been that people from the East are reluctant to speak English, the language of the West. Something one does not find at world conferences of churches and Christian organiza-



tions here became reality: German, the neglected, almost forgotten, third ecumenical language was again heard. For every German present it was cause both for shame and joy, after two world wars had made German almost a dead language in ecumenical circles.

With wise foresight the Planning Committee had invited "consultants" from 14 European organizations which either had already formed European committees or are on the point of doing so. This brought to Nyborg representatives of the World Alliances of YMCA's and YWCA's, the Liselund continuation committee, the committee entrusted with organizing a European conference of the men's organizations of the churches, the European section of the World Committee for Christian Broadcasting, the European Study Group for Protestant Information, the Committee on the Christian Responsibility for European Cooperation, and the Conference of European Youth Secretaries. We can be grateful that the European churches are resolved from the start to work constructively with the existing ecumenical organizations for laymen and youth.

In looking at the results of the conference, one can safely say that the attainable goal was actually attained: a European Council of Churches was not formed but a working committee was, consisting once again of Dr. Emmen, Archbishop Kiivit and Bishop Lilje. Dr. Hans Harms, associate director of the Division of Studies of the WCC, was chosen to serve as secretary of the conference. In addition an advisory committee of 11 members was formed. Certain questions remained unanswered at Nyborg, those at issue between East and West as well as some within the West itself. Nevertheless the Christians of Europe have reason to be thankful: the churches of Europe from Moscow to Portugal, Malta to Norway, are again in contact with one another.

## II

What were the intangible results of the Nyborg conference? They are to be found, we believe, in the recognition of certain tasks arising from the practical cooperation of the European churches. Three tasks stand out in particular, which deserve to be dealt with in coming years: (1) coming to terms with the life and thought of Europe; (2) encounter with Eastern Orthodoxy; (3) the question of the European churches' responsibility both in

public life and within and among the churches at the present hour.

## European Life and Thought

To understand the inner life of our particular portion of the globe, one must ask once again what the spiritual and intellectual ties are that bind it together or that should serve to unite it. Here we are still groping. Helmut Gollwitzer has done some good preliminary work in his book *Europabild und Europa-gedanke*. He, August Winnig and the theologians Schumann, Asmussen and Walz have contributed to a demythologizing and de-ideologizing of the Europe concept. Through study projects and discussions the European churches should attempt to clarify their own bases and the question of how, starting from there, they can deal with the problems of our day. It would help to clarify the European situation if we knew whether we are today at the "end of the Constantinian era." In his address at Nyborg Prof. Pierre Burgelin of Paris pointed out that one immense difference between Constantine's age and our own is that the pagan world today is post-Christian. From all appearances, he said, a new beginning is therefore much more difficult today than it was originally. Here the church can learn only from its own Lord, he went on to say. Evidently the words "Constantinian era" denote different things to different theologians. Some doubt that that era is yet over. The Nyborg conference called for the church to fight for the freedom to carry out its mission. A statement issued by the conference reads: "This freedom consists above all in the freedom to proclaim the word of God and to serve men. For the church to be free does not mean that the church is to rule. What the church's service is, of course, needs further definition."

Another problem which ecumenical discussion on the spiritual and intellectual situation in Europe may illuminate is the question of the "encounter" of Christian faith with modern technological society. The paper on this subject<sup>1</sup> by Canon E. R. Wickham of England brought to mind the postwar ministry of the Evangelical Academies and the writings of H. D. Wendland, professor of sociology at the University of Münster. Canon Wickham noted four characteristics of "the new society":

<sup>1</sup> Printed in *The Ecumenical Review*, April, 1959, pp. 259-267.



urbanization, class stratification, the emergence of new social structures, new axioms of thought. He called for new studies of society and "new machinery for engaging the 'principalities and powers' of the technological society." At the end of his address he said something which the European churches will do well to ponder in the coming years:

Once "God" was manipulated by magic, and his actions wholly arbitrary; it was advance when he is understood as clothed by nature. It was further advance when he was understood to act in history, responsive in grace or wrath to the obedience or disobedience of men. It is further advance when he is also understood to be providentially at work through and in the web of human relationships and human endeavor, of which industry is a supreme example. This is biblical; it is one illustration of the reinterpretation of Providence that might convey something of God's nature and purpose to modern men, at the point of their strength.

The European churches will come to terms with the life and thought of modern society only if they respect the technological development which has taken place over the years. Its task consists in approaching that development through the gospel. Not a few European churches will have to do some "radical rethinking," which should call forth some changes in the social structure of the congregations on the continent. Thesis four of the Nyborg statement on this subject is characteristic of the thinking of the conference:

For most of the churches of Europe the parochial system has been determinative for centuries. In many cases that system is today no longer adequate and hinders the church in attempting to exercise its responsibility to men in the new society. To reach modern men the church must travel other paths.

In Nyborg political and social problems occupied the foreground. Continued discussion will be fruitful only if the churches also concern themselves with currents in contemporary philosophy and literature and, not least, with the revolution in architecture, the plastic and graphic arts, and the theater.

### Encounter with Eastern Orthodoxy

The presence of representatives of the Orthodox church at Nyborg was not the only thing that called forth a dialogue with Eastern theology. The issues themselves, after slumbering for centuries as it were, have provoked the dialogue. At Nyborg a study group chaired by Dr. Martin Niemöller discussed the theme "The Contribution of Eastern Orthodoxy to

### European Culture in the Past and the Present."

The basis of the discussion was an impressive paper read by Archbishop Iakovos, at that time Metropolitan of Melita and representative of the Ecumenical Patriarch at the WCC in Geneva. He demonstrated how Orthodoxy has made significant contributions to the European conception of life, emphasizing particularly the ideas of martyrdom and regionalism. In the discussion the group turned its attention to what the Western churches can learn and appropriate, in the present world situation, from Orthodoxy.

The encounter is just beginning. The differences in the Eastern and Western conceptions of the relation between life in the spirit and life in the world dampen hopes for arriving at quick understanding. Further discussions will have to examine above all what the Orthodox church means by the fellowship of believers (*koinonia*). Perhaps when viewed in this light from the East, Western theology will be seen to be too individualistic.

The Orthodox taking part in the present discussions live in Moscow, Athens and Constantinople. At present even these three places breathe a very different atmosphere, and however orthodox the Orthodox want to be, there nevertheless exist in the life and thought of Orthodoxy quite varied currents and tendencies. Since the majority of Orthodox Christians are found in the Russian church, heightened and indeed almost political significance attaches to the present ecumenical contacts. One basic point of difference—and at the same time a point of possible understanding—lies in the different attitudes to suffering. Thesis four of the report of the Nyborg study group points out that "Orthodoxy accepts suffering as a cross to be borne, whereas in Western Christianity the general tendency is to release oneself and others from all forms of suffering as quickly as possible."<sup>2</sup> Thoroughgoing theological discussion of suffering can perhaps lead to the establishing of brotherly ties between the churches of the East and West, ties which lines of demarcation and barbed wire could not sever.

How promising are the beginnings of this East-West dialogue is shown by thesis six of the report of the study group:

<sup>2</sup> *The Ecumenical Review*, April, 1959, p. 321, where the report has been printed.



The service rendered by Orthodox Christians in the world is rooted in the very heart of their church life, which is the liturgy. This poses a question for the Western church: should it not ensure that its service in the world also is nourished and strengthened by the very heart of its church life, namely by the Christian message with which it has been entrusted?<sup>2</sup>

In an exchange such as we have been describing each side comes to understand itself as well as the other side better. We would hope therefore that the ecumenical council called by Pope John XXIII after the Nyborg conference was over, may make possible a new form of encounter with Roman Catholics. For centuries the confessional walls have hindered if not paralyzed such encounter. Rome was not represented at Nyborg and the Roman Catholic question was, tragically, not on the agenda. However, people acquainted with the ecumenical situation are thankful for what was achieved in these first conversations between Protestant and Greek Orthodox Christians. No one can say today how an encounter between Roman Catholics, Orthodox and Lutherans would fare. Already some unforeseen difficulties have arisen. Sooner or later, however, the conversation between Rome, Constantinople and Wittenberg must again be resumed. In Europe that conversation will be conducted with scrupulous attention to fundamental differences. Not a few in each party cherish the hope, however, that a spirit of passionate brotherly love will also prevail.

### Responsibility Within and Without

The committee which because of its composition, leadership and subject, probably occupied the most important place at Nyborg was that which considered the question: "Do we have anything in common in our Christian heritage and our Christian responsibility for the churches of Europe?" Renowned churchmen from East and West took part in the discussion presided over by Dr. Novak of Prague, bishop of the Moravian Brethren in Czechoslovakia, who with truly "brotherly" fairness balanced off the various viewpoints in a search for the common elements. The discussion approached the difficult political questions frankly and candidly. It developed that in Europe too it is possible in the ecumenical sphere to bring out into the open and to adjust the sharpest tensions. If it is at all possible to live with and finally settle the issues

between East and West, it will only be in an atmosphere such as prevailed at Nyborg. Discussion was based on a lecture by Prof. Niels H. Sørensen of Copenhagen and one by Prof. J.B. Soucek of Prague. There was general agreement with Prof. Sørensen when he pointed out very trenchantly that the Christian churches of Europe share in a common "heritage of guilt" which they, as part of the white race and heirs of Christianity, have accumulated toward Asia and Africa. His characterization of the churches' heritage as consisting in law, truth and the dignity of the individual brought to mind similar remarks made earlier by Bishop Otto Dibelius. Sørensen also had the courage to look critically at the suppression of the Hungarian revolution.

Outlining the special responsibility of the European churches, Prof. Soucek called for a renewal of theological research, a restructuring of the church, and the courage on the part of European Christendom to live a new life. A heated discussion developed, understandably, about the interpretation of the Hungarian revolution. A church leader from Hungary attempted to explicate the suppression of the uprising. A Czech tried to serve as mediator in the discussion, but Prof. Sørensen and others stood by their criticism. Although the participants were not able to come to an understanding on this point, they nevertheless stayed together under the word of God, always looking for new and different points of understanding and cooperation.

As was mentioned above, we are just beginning to discuss the question of the common heritage of the churches of Europe and their mission in public life in our day. That discussion can be fruitfully continued, however, if it proceeds from the assumptions which guided the delegates at the conference to agreement on the following statements:

"(1) The churches in Europe have a common heritage, not the least part of which is the gospel entrusted to them. That has contributed in a special way to the recognition in Europe of law, truth and the dignity of the individual as both gifts and tasks.

"(2) The churches in Europe will fulfill their responsibility only by being churches. Christians believe not in Europe but in the Lord and Savior of the world. Hence they take their responsibility for Europe seriously. They can be churches in the full sense of the word, however, only when they follow

<sup>2</sup> Ibid., p. 322.



their Lord in their faith and life.

"(3) In the past European Christendom has often discredited its message in the eyes of its own continent and of other peoples. The responsibility of Christians in Europe therefore begins with the recognition and confession of this guilt.

"(4) In the uncertainty of our time, and despite their weakness, the churches of Europe are called, in faith in their risen Lord, to a living hope and to the service of men. The following can and should contribute to that end: rethinking in the area of theology; a refashioning of preaching, pastoral care and Christian service in the changed structures of our society; working together in Christian love for reconciliation and peace."

In the final session of the conference there was another tense moment when the Hungarian delegation brought in a declaration on the use of nuclear weapons. The favorable atmosphere of the conference is indicated by the fact that the delegates were able to endorse the declaration unanimously.

It read:

It is the task of the church to pray and to work to the end that all nuclear powers will forego the use of nuclear weapons under an effective international control, and that the peoples of Europe and the whole world will be freed from the threat of nuclear warfare. Europe should serve as the basis of peaceful cooperation among all peoples and not as the basis for the destruction of life.

### Europe can Serve

The general secretary of the WCC, Dr. W. A. Visser 't Hooft, who attended the conference in an advisory capacity, reminded the European delegates of their responsibility for the whole world. A European conference of churches that puzzles only over its own problems, forgetting that there are brothers both within and beyond the borders of Europe, would again be in danger of becoming guilty of spiritual introversion, he said. At the suggestion of Dr. Visser 't Hooft, the conference adopted a statement which will be decisive for future cooperation between Europe, on the one hand, and America, Asia and Africa, on the other:

The churches of Europe should demonstrate that Europe can also serve. They should therefore be ready to offer to the peoples of other parts of the world such self-effacing help as those regions may expect from Europe.

This ministry should consist in the first instance of cooperation with the younger churches in the work of evangelism, but should also include a readiness to provide men and materials for the development of underdeveloped areas.

We in Europe are still far from the goal. Conversation between churches and across borders is just beginning. All of us who carry any responsibility in these efforts are aware of the difficulties. That discerning Spanish observer of Europe, Salvador de Madariaga, has written in his *Portrait of Europe*:

This is Europe. A landscape of quality, not quantity, rich in nuances and tensions, where mankind has achieved such clearly defined contours in individuals and nations that one can intuitively sum each up in a word: the Englishman, an island; the Frenchman, a crystal; the Spaniard, a castle; the German, a stream; the Italian, a [fencing] foil. All are so characteristic that among them each form of life is like a beam of light which in falling upon different crystals is reflected in a thousand different ways.

In this atmosphere it is difficult to build bridges. It is difficult but magnificent to love one's Nyborg neighbor, one's brother in Europe. Christians cannot build Europe but they can seek and find their European neighbor. For their future cooperation in Europe the following words from the Nyborg conference point the way: "In the present tensions between East and West the churches of Europe have a clearcut task, to give ear to one another, to talk to one another, to work with one another, to pray for one another."

WERNER JENTSCH

### East Asian Christian Conference

#### Kuala Lumpur: Marginal Glosses

THE ELECTRIC FANS are humming. Lush jungle trees breathe heavily outside our rooftop garden. Sandstone-colored lizards skitter up and down the slightly swaying green lath blinds. The mercury at the Majestic Hotel registers 99 or 100 degrees Fahrenheit. It is May, 1959. One hundred and fifty men and women listen to lectures and discussions



in the humid heat of Kuala Lumpur, Malaya, and right in front of them, above the chairman's table, stretched out in front of the sunscreen, is a huge piece of linen cloth with the following significant text: *Inaugural Assembly, East Asia Christian Conference, "Witnesses Together," Kuala Lumpur, Malaya. May 14-24, 1959.*

### Regionalism

Most of the people present at the Kuala Lumpur Assembly were non-Western. Nearly all the plenary speakers were Asian. This was according to design. It was a conference for East Asian Christians, more specifically, a conference of delegates appointed by East Asian councils or churches (many more councils than churches). The New Zealand and the Australian councils of churches were also invited, and accepted membership. But the non-white emphasis was unmistakable.

When the arms of the World Council of Churches—after having enfolded chiefly the regions of the West—were stretched out toward other regions, the churches of these other regions discovered an important thing. They discovered that if the WCC were to become useful, a WCC-oriented regionalism was necessary. The age of ecumenical regionalism has come. People of the West should not be surprised or dismayed at this development. It has been inherent in the ecumenical movement from the outset, just as it has been inherent in the modern movements toward political and commercial universalism, without which, incidentally, the church would not be thinking and acting in ecumenical and ecumenical-regional terms.

This new kind of church regionalism also affects the regionalism which is a part of the heritage of the International Missionary Council. The IMC was formed in a situation in which mission was generally regarded as moving from West to non-West. It was formed on the assumption that the church deals with the non-West through specialized agencies called mission societies or boards. Africa and Asia became the special preserve of these societies. The new regionalism manifested in Kuala Lumpur and, before that at Prapat, Indonesia, and at the Marangu and Ghana conferences in Africa, is of a radically different order. It is a regionalism that speaks a great deal of church-to-church relations and emphasizes the need for inter-regional conversation and encounter. The mission organ in

the West is not the sole outlet for ecumenical needs anymore. The EACC will be a channel of spiritual communication between East Asian churches. There are limitations and dangers in regional ecumenicity. Some of them will be mentioned in this article. But the empirical fact of regionalism is facing everyone today and constant adjustments will have to be made in the planning and strategy of the WCC and the IMC to guide these adjustments and accommodate to them.

The Lutheran churches of the East Asian region will share in the regional concerns. Those in India are part of the EACC through their Federation of Evangelical Lutheran Churches. The Batak church of Sumatra is an EACC member through its central board. The EACC will give Lutheran churches a new insight into the life, work and study of other East Asian groups. This will be true of all participating denominations. From denominationally limited international relations with an organ in the West, the East Asian churches will now move into much more consistent contact with fellow-Asians in their own region.

The inaugural assembly of the East Asian Christian Conference manifested a new ecumenical dimension in the lives of the East Asian churches. We should expect, and work for, an increased intra-Asian flow of information and incentive.

The EACC will be a channel of communication between East Asian churches and the churches of the West and Africa. This channel will not supplant the mission board-daughter church relations but it will slowly change the character of those relations.

### Race and Nation

It is inevitable and perhaps in certain respects salutary that Christian regionalism draws some of its impetus from sentiments of racial pride and national freedom. The Kuala Lumpur Assembly was no exception in this regard. Many of the criticisms levelled at the missionary enterprise and the mission church seemed to assume that Western people were responsible for the difficulties (as well as the positive contributions, which were also recognized). Much of the racial Asianism and Asian nationalism displayed in talks and discussions tended to assume the character of criticism of the West. Western people at the conference appeared to accept this as a matter of course. It seems that more ought to have been said about the place



of nationalism and racism in church regionalism. Modern attempts at creating a cultural and Christian Europeanism provide warning signals for other kinds of regionalism, to say nothing of the older forms of Western nationalism and racism. As Christians we should not force one another into defensive positions. Regionalism has tended to do so all along, on racial and nationalistic grounds. But the facts are not so unequivocal, either as regards the Western attitude and contribution to Asia and Africa or concerning the Asian and African case against the West. I am afraid we force each other to apologize a little bit too much for the fact that we were born in the West or in Africa or Asia. Right now a Western Christian in an Asian Christian conference is expected to accept as an axiom that most of the present ills of Asia, in general, and the Asian churches, in particular, were caused by the West and its churches. There is a heavy debt to be paid by the West to Asia and Africa, but Asia and Africa are in the same danger of racism and nationalism as the West. Asian and African churches should take heed lest they lose that essential part of Christian faith which makes it fundamentally immaterial where we were born and which informs us that the ills of the church are not endemic to only one region of the world. The fact that New Zealand and Australia were invited to join, and did join, the EACC will serve as a healthy reminder of the need for interregional and interracial unity.

At the EACC Assembly one could not help but wonder why only East Asia is included in the regional movement. There was not even an observer from West Asia and to the best of my knowledge no reference was made to the church in that part of Asia. Do the common political and social ambitions of East Asia prompt this particular Christian grouping?

The overwhelmingly generous welcome given to the three African guests was significant. The hope was expressed that the African Christians would soon be able to establish their own regional assembly. The Indian leader who introduced one of the African leaders to the assembly said repeatedly that the African Christians now were "at the point where we (Indians) were 20 to 25 years ago," and that they (the Africans) would hopefully soon be "where we are now." The unintentional superciliousness of these remarks served as an illustration of the new

nationalism and the racial surge in Asian countries. One could not refrain from a little smile of recognition: Is not that kind of condescension precisely what Asia has resented so much in its dealings with people and organizations from the West? Must everything be repeated? Perhaps yes, because pride is unfortunately not confined to Western hearts and territories. Some modern slogans about the West in its relation to Africa and Asia would seem to assume that the latter are less open to sinfulness. The Kuala Lumpur conference, in its joyful assertion of nation and race as vehicles for Christ, was not entirely free from such an assumption.

### Unity

The EACC displayed a great deal of enthusiasm for ecumenical cooperation. This was done without much analysis of doctrinal bases. After all, the Kuala Lumpur assembly gathered around the banner of "witnessing together," did not intend to discuss differences of a traditional, doctrinal nature. Yet, many speeches presupposed an ecumenical concept which was nearly doctrinaire. An increased degree of organic, organizational union was assumed to be not only the extenuation of the sin of division but also the most effective means of evangelism. This is not a surprising concept in East Asia where the irritation over and criticism of Western missions and churches largely centers around the existence of many denominational divisions.

There is undoubtedly a theological relativism underneath some of the Asian impatience with what is regarded as divisions conditioned by Western questions. If we are to transcend divisions in a common affirmation of a common faith, "theological relativism is not a sound basis," as the general secretary of the WCC pointed out at a plenary session. It would be dangerous, he added, to treat the differences as though they did not exist. Although they "are not the final revelation of what God in his word has to say to us," the historical decisions behind them have meaning for all of us, in Asia and in the West.

There was a tendency on the part of many in Kuala Lumpur to dismiss confessional ties and movements as prompted mainly by non-theological factors, such as institutionalism and monetary concerns. The truth is of course not that simple. It would be just as simple—and as false—to maintain that the creation of the Church of South India



was mainly motivated by nationalistic forces.

In relation to the doctrine of organic union which underlay so much of the thinking at Kuala Lumpur, one might wonder whether it is right to assume that doctrinal agreement should under all circumstances be followed by organizational union. It has become customary to take this for granted. "To be one that the world may believe" is a phrase which is nearly always interpreted as a statement about increased organizational union.

The sin of division would be done away with if we agreed to unite organizationally. Is organizational division always a manifestation of sin? Let me be heretical and ask that question. I do not say that situations do not arise where union is not the right Christian course of action. I only say that the axiom that doctrinal unity once attained should result in organizational union is no Christian axiom. The EACC—mainly because of its questions about our Western divisions—is peculiarly tempted to take them lightly and, once a minimum of rational agreement is achieved, to try to conquer sin and increase efficiency by organizational fusion.

These considerations do not take anything away from the importance of the planning of the EACC in the fields of evangelism, study and inter-church aid. These plans necessitate ecumenical coordination in order to be carried out. The Kuala Lumpur Assembly provided an incentive for coordinated ecumenical action. The participants also experienced the unity in Christ, which may or may not result in organizational fusion.

## Aid

Whereas the Prapat conference tended to speak of the Asian church as a castle to be strengthened, the Kuala Lumpur conference spoke more of the danger of becoming a small Christian ghetto. Rapid social changes constitute a challenge which the church cannot overlook. One wishes to be more than a ghetto.

At the same time a new ecclesiological situation has arisen in which the Asian churches desire to deal with other churches as churches. The missionary movement thus becomes more than a movement covered by missionary societies.

The new social situation and the new ecclesiological situation call for an exchange of mutual aid in terms of persons and aid projects. The EACC will help to find oppor-

tunities for Asian missionaries in Asian lands. The EACC will encourage intensified aid geared especially to the new social situation and the need for increased stewardship power. The statement on inter-church aid adopted by the Kuala Lumpur Assembly said in part: "The EACC expresses general approval of the above lists of criteria and categories, except that it is convinced that the present project lists do not always indicate the most pressing needs of the churches in the region, especially in the realm of stewardship and evangelism, and urges that the present framework of the agreement between the IMC and the WCC be adjusted so that such needs also can be met through the procedures of the Division as they emerge."

The new name of the committee of the EACC which will handle this work is "Committee for Inter-Church Aid for Mission and Service."

Precisely where the line should be drawn between "mission" and "service" is difficult to determine. But it is significant that both practical aid plans and mission concerns came under one heading, to be dealt with by one committee. Since the WCC and the IMC continue to be the executive organs for implementation of projects, the decisions and proposals of the EACC concerning the character and scope of mutual aid will undoubtedly influence the structure and function of future inter-church aid and mission departments, both nationally and internationally.

There would of course be much more to report from the wealth of study projects and practical programs submitted and adopted for future action, preferably before the next assembly four years from now. There were indeed so many project proposals that one feels a little sorry for the new secretariat of three, scattered all over East Asia. But it was a great experience to partake of all the joyful planning, not least for a Westerner like myself who sees and believes in the need for an international confessional organization and its ecumenical potentialities and contributions, at the same time that he recognizes there are very essential tasks that only the WCC can carry out. And some of these tasks will now be furthered by the East Asian Christian Conference, inaugurated in Kuala Lumpur, Malaya, in May, 1959.

BENGT HOFFMAN



## *World Council of Churches*

### **African Self-discovery**

AFRICA IS ON THE WAY to discovering itself. Two Africans meet, one from the English-speaking and the other from the French-speaking Cameroons. The first is in many ways a perfect Englishman; one discovers it soon in his manner of eating, of discussing, and in the whole outlook which English education has given him. The second radiates an unmistakable French atmosphere. The two greet each other in European manner, shaking hands and wanting to begin a conversation. But then frustration occurs. The English-speaking one does not know any French, and the other does not speak English. With an annoyed grin the two start turning away, when suddenly one of them tries a few words in a Cameroons dialect, hoping that the other will understand it. And indeed, when the other replies in the same tongue, nothing short of a transfiguration happens to both of them. They greet each other for a second time, in the African manner this time, and sit in a corner together and start talking. They exchange views about the political situation in their respective countries, about the whole system of education and social progress, about the future of West Africa, about what is happening in North and South Africa, about the great new Africa which is freeing itself from bondage, and about the new relationship between Africa and the world—Africa discovering itself.

This incident could have occurred in any one of the African meetings which are at present being organized in Africa itself or among African students in Europe. It actually happened this last April at the seminar on "Christian Obedience in Africa Today," a meeting for senior African students studying in Europe, organized by John Knox House, Geneva, under the auspices of the Department on the Laity of the World Council of Churches.

What we discovered in this seminar was, first of all, the extreme diversity and division of present-day Africa. It was difficult to have real communication between areas under English influence on the one side, and under French influence on the other; between East and West Africa; between free African nations and participants from the Belgian and Portuguese colonies; between the areas

where Africans are a dominant majority and those where white settlers still remain a dominant minority. This diversity is also reflected in the church situation. Where the missionary societies are poor, much confidence seems to have grown between the African church and the missionaries. The very few Christian schools and hospitals are cherished and maintain their truly Christian character. In other areas where imposing missionary institutions have been built up and where missionary money and missionary dominance often appear to go hand in hand, severe criticism is voiced by African laymen and pastors. Yet, beyond all the divisions and diversities, the vision of a coming unity animates all African self-discovery.

The incident recorded above should, however, not be wrongly interpreted. There is no old African way to unite Africa; the customs and tribes differ greatly even within one country, and it was a great exception that the representatives from the two Cameroons happened to know the same African language, because there are hundreds of quite different languages and dialects. European influence has not only divided, it has also united. In fact, it is the present impact of the West which shakes Africa and challenges it to search for its own unity. And only a common fight for freedom, coupled with—what is far more difficult!—a common commitment for the reconstruction of a new African society, can bring forth a united new Africa.

What is Christian obedience in this situation? The seminar in Geneva began with an address on "The Church and the World." One emphasis of the program provided for a deeper knowledge of the African world: lectures and discussions on rapid social change in Africa and its impact on the structures of African society; a lecture on the role of women and new patterns of the relationships between men and women, focusing our attention on this vital point in the changing Africa of today; a "soirée africaine" and a film, "The Mark of the Hawk," helping us to enter more deeply into the present-day atmosphere of African life. The other emphasis of the program centered around the church in Africa: in worship and Bible studies we tried to refresh our vision of a living church; a lecture on "The Community of Renewal" opened our eyes to the most revealing lessons of church history in Africa, beginning with early Christianity in



North Africa in St. Augustine's days, to the issues which the African churches are facing today; a lecture on "The Responsibility of Christian Students" brought home to us that the church is not somewhere "beyond," but that we are the church. In the seminar groups which followed, we therefore tried to discern the specific role which Christians have to fulfill in the African world. While one of the groups continued to discuss mainly the Christian responsibility in the realm of changing social life, the other dealt with our Christian obedience in African politics.

The heated discussion on the Christian obedience in the political realm was partly due to the picture we had seen. "The Mark of the Hawk," produced by the United Presbyterian Church USA, and mainly intended for an American audience, shows the struggle for independence of an African nation and the role played by a white missionary and an African pastor. The picture has many weak points (such as the quite irrelevant anti-communist scenes), yet the major criticism of the African audience did not hit at these all too obvious "Americanisms." The sincere attempt to take African nationalism seriously and to show that Christian obedience includes also political action was welcomed. But the fact that in the midst of the emergency situation the African pastor and the white missionary have no other message than non-violence met with sharp criticism. "This is opiate for the people! Should the whites preach non-violence to us after having used us Africans to fight their own wars? Have the French, the Swiss, the Americans attained their freedom without violence, and did the Christians of those nations preach non-violence while their countries fought for freedom?"—"Yes, you are right; but must we follow the way of the 'Christian' West? Is there not also the way of Gandhi?"

This fragment of a conversation gives a glimpse of the passionate search of African students to discover the content of their Christian obedience. The statement which follows expresses in a more comprehensive and general way which direction this search took during the seminar in Geneva.

HANS-RUEDI WEBER

### Christian Obedience in Africa Today

*The statement of a seminar of African students held at John Knox House, Geneva, Switzerland, March 30 to April 4, 1959.*

We, the participants of a conference on Christian Obedience in Africa Today, are grateful for this opportunity of being together in the name of Christ for the sake of Africa. We come from thirteen countries in Africa and are students of twenty-two different colleges and universities in Europe. We are gathered together at a time when Africa is going through a period of radical and rapid social and political changes. Our attention has been centered on these changes and on the challenge they pose for Christians today and tomorrow.

Through our common Bible study and discussion, we see anew that to be a Christian inevitably means to be involved in the affairs of this world. We believe that the Risen Christ is Lord of the world—hence, of Africa, and that he is present in all that is happening in Africa by his judgment and his mercy; it is our task to discern it. It is not our task "to bring Christ to Africa," but rather to proclaim and manifest his active presence there. We are therefore compelled to ask ourselves how we can participate in his loving service for the lands of Africa today.

We find it difficult to make a clear distinction between the demands made on Christians in the territories still under colonial rule as opposed to those countries which have gained their independence. However, we recognize that the problems and tasks involved are not in every case identical. Further, the situation varies greatly from area to area.

In areas which are still in a colonial or semi-colonial situation, the struggle for independence is the most urgent issue. We endorse the statement of the first All-Africa Church Conference at Ibadan, in January, 1958, that the church

dare not assume a passive, indifferent or neutral attitude towards the crucial political and social issues of the times. It must uphold righteousness, champion the oppressed and declare the sovereignty of God over all creation, including the institutions of man.

We consider that this charge can be concretely carried out by Christians in various ways. Where there is limited freedom for voting, we must equip both ourselves and our fellow-nationals to exercise the right to vote responsibly. We have the duty to be well informed about, and think through, what is going on in our own countries.



Moreover, we should seek to help our fellow-Christians in Western countries, especially those countries which have colonial or semi-colonial links, to be so informed about the actual situation both of political, economic and social injustice, and the movement toward independence in Africa, that they may be encouraged to express their solidarity with us in making appropriate representations to their own governments and to the United Nations.

We have the duty to play an active and constructive part in the nationalist movement of our country. Where all peaceful means for achieving national independence fail, we are faced with an agonizing question: Does our obedience as Christians exclude the possibility of violent action to achieve our rightful liberty? We realize that this question has exercised the minds of Christians throughout the centuries and that so far there has been no clear answer between using violent and non-violent means; but we note that in the past Christians have often chosen the way of violence when no other way seemed possible and when violence seemed likely to bring forth positive results.

The struggle for independence also includes preparation for building up the life of an independent nation. Christians will respond to this challenge by helping to prepare a well-equipped leadership and to raise the general level of education of the whole community.

In countries which have already achieved their freedom, we believe that Christians are called to play a vital role in constructing a responsible society. This role should be played in the first place through the integrity of church members who hold responsible positions in the life of the nation. Church members should be encouraged to accept such public positions as their Christian vocation. Christian obedience will also have to be manifest with regard to the changing pattern of family life and the newly emerging role of women in African society; the development of the kind of education basic to the growth of a new Africa; the transformation of tribal society into the community of an African nation; the problems posed by multiracial groups; and the positive collaboration with non-Christian leaders and groups in working out new social structures.

We feel that in our situation today we have the responsibility to express our solidarity as Christians with our fellow-Africans both

in our common struggle for independence and in our joint efforts for the reconstruction of national life. An equally important task faces Christians with regard to evolving positive approaches to problems posed by economic ties with the rest of the world, the need for developing the national resources of our countries, and the participation of the African nation in regional and international organizations.

In all our discussions, we have been made aware of the crucial importance of the church in Africa. We have been conscious of the contribution which the church has made through the preaching of the gospel, through the new life our people have received in Christ, and through education which has greatly helped the nationalist movement. But we are also aware of the challenges which face the church today. There is a resurgence and growth of non-Christian religion. Urbanization has brought in its train the forces of materialism and secularism. The church itself is sorely divided into denominations and sects. Interracial and intertribal tensions within the Christian community have further weakened the church's witness. Furthermore, the church in Africa is seeking to be freed from foreign missionary control and to become autonomous. Yet the true autonomy of the church is only possible in total dependence on Christ and interdependence between independent churches. This total dependence on Christ demands the constant worship of God and the nurture of the faithful for discipleship in the world. It demands faithfulness in preaching in love the gospel to all men, and in endeavoring to be the community of renewal in every realm of life.

We, therefore, who have met during these days as members of Christ's church, confess our total allegiance to him and our willingness to be his obedient servants in and for the sake of Africa. Christ is indeed present in Africa, and where he the Lord is, we his servants are to be.

## *Announcement of Scholarships*

### **Lutheran World Federation**

#### **Department of Theology**

THROUGH THE DEPARTMENT of Theology the Commission on Theology of the LWF is offering scholarships for study



abroad in 1960-1961. During the time it has operated a scholarship program the department has been able to shape it in such a way that it occupies a clearly defined place among the programs of secular and church organizations. The following is a description of the distinguishing characteristics of the program of the Department of Theology.

The main goal of the program is to bring the Lutheran churches of the world closer together by giving a select number of young pastors and students of theology the opportunity to acquaint themselves with the theology and life of other churches and thus to bring to their work in their own churches new ideas and insights. The Lutheran churches of the world have been shaped to a high degree by differing traditions and differing systems of education. The histories of which they have been a part, and the accompanying sociological and political factors, have also had a hand in their development. In our day it is imperative that the various Lutheran churches grow closer together by seeking to understand the differences separating them despite their common faith. People who have the opportunity to become thoroughly acquainted with the teaching and life of another church are in the best position to contribute to such understanding. In conducting its scholarship program the Department of Theology therefore lays great emphasis upon the union of theory and practice. Even though study at a seminary or school of theology occupies the chief place in the student's program, he is also given many opportunities to participate (by actual service if possible) in the life of the sponsoring church. Our goal, then, is that selected representatives of Lutheran churches should contribute toward bringing those churches closer together.

Hence in addition to feeling himself responsible for himself, his own goals and his program of study, every recipient of a scholarship from the Department of Theology should also look upon himself as a representative of his church who upon his return will put to work in the theology and life of that church his new impressions and experiences. Before beginning study each scholarship holder must therefore promise that upon conclusion of the period of study he will return to his own church. The department also hopes, however, that upon their return the scholarship holders will be given

opportunity by their churches to put what they have learned to effective use.

The scholarships are regarded as an opportunity for additional training above and beyond that already acquired by the student for service in his own church. Applicants must therefore be able to give evidence of having successfully completed the theological training required by their church (in countries with an Anglo-Saxon system of education the degree of B.D. or B.Th.; in Germany, passing of the first theological examination; in Scandinavia, the rank of *cand. teol.*).

Applications should have the full endorsement of the proper authorities in the applicant's church and should be accompanied by letters of recommendation indicating clearly that the applicant is above average in ability and aptitude. Applicants must also be able to demonstrate a command of the language of the country of study sufficient to enable them to fit into the program of study from the very beginning. In this connection it might be pointed out that scholarships are not granted for study in one's own or in a neighboring country (in Canada for US students, e.g., or in Austria for Germans). Applications for study at non-Lutheran educational institutions are also not accepted.

The goal of the study program as outlined above can be attained only when the period of study is sufficiently long. Scholarships are therefore offered for 10 months (two semesters) or in the USA, 12 months. Shorter periods of study do not fall within the scope of this program, nor do private study projects. In general scholarships provide the following:

- (1) Two semesters of study at a Lutheran theological school. (In the United States the scholarship holder studies for one semester at a seminary and then spends six months interning in a congregation.)

- (2) Travel costs from the border of the candidate's home country to his destination.

- (3) Free board and lodging in a dormitory, wherever that is possible (e.g. in Germany, the USA and Canada, but not in the Scandinavian countries).

- (4) A monthly allowance of pocket money to pay for the most essential personal expenses.

- (5) A one-time grant for the purchase of theological books.

- (6) Health and accident insurance, issued according to the terms applicable in the particular country.



If certain conditions make it impossible for a student to accept the offer of free accommodation in a dormitory, he may submit an application to receive the corresponding amount in cash; in such cases, however, he will also be expected to contribute his fair share toward the costs of living abroad. In countries with particularly high living costs (such as Sweden), it is also assumed that the scholarship holder will sometimes have to supplement the regular grant.

Application forms may be obtained from the candidate's national committee or from the LWF's Department of Theology, Geneva. Applicants must return the forms to their national committee not later than January 1, 1960 (in the USA and Canada, not later than December 1, 1959). The final decision on the applications will be made in February, 1960, by a subcommittee of the Commission on Theology.

The Department of Theology (17 route de Malagnou, Geneva) will gladly supply further information.

### World Mission

The scholarship program of the LWF Department of World Mission has been in existence since 1955 and during those three years of operation has benefited 28 students from LWF-related churches in eight Asian and African countries. Its purpose is to train and develop African and Asian pastors and lay workers for service in their churches through academic and/or practical study either in their home countries or abroad.

Scholarships are available to applicants who have been recommended for study by their church (or mission, if there is no organized church) and who, upon completion of their study, will return into the service of their church.

The period of study is one academic year, with a possibility of extension upon continued recommendation by the sponsoring church or mission. The scholarship grants, to which the home church or mission and if possible the applicant himself or his family, are required to contribute, cover travel between home country and country of study, tuition, books, board and lodging, pocket money, clothing allowance. The DWM also grants partial scholarships to supplement scholarship grants from other sources. The student is expected to earn part of his expenses.

Application forms and additional information can be obtained from the Department of World Mission of the LWF, Geneva. Applications should be forwarded to the Department of World Mission by the home church or mission together with a statement recording the official action of the applicant's church or mission that it is sponsoring the student for a scholarship. The DWM staff acts upon the application and in consultation with the student and his home church or mission determines the place of study and the amount of the grant.

### World Service

The exchange of church workers under the auspices of the LWF's Department of World Service has been in existence since 1956. The program gives pastors and laymen of member churches of the LWF the opportunity to become better acquainted and to get a better picture of church life in other countries. In addition to fostering the personal, spiritual and professional development of individuals, the program seeks to bring churches closer together and to find more effective ways to proclaim the gospel in our day.

In the first three years of its existence, 57 persons from 12 countries took part in the program. Of these, 57 per cent were members of the clergy, 43 per cent were lay people; the ratio of men to women was about four to one.

Church workers may apply to take part in the exchange who are between the ages of 25 and 50 and who would like to spend a brief period of time (usually three months, occasionally longer) in a church in a foreign country observing and participating in a certain area of church work. Some of the areas studied by past exchangeers are pastoral work, congregational life, stewardship and evangelism, evangelical academies, youth work, student work, social and institutional work, church music, Sunday schools, religious journalism, and others. Study at a foreign university is not possible under this program.

Applicants should submit their applications to their LWF national committee (or if there is none, to the headquarters of their church). All applications need the approval of the national committee (or church headquarters), and for this reason should be directed to the LWF only via these channels, which also distribute the application forms.



Wherever feasible, the exchangee's expenses in the country of study will be borne by the member church(es) or national committee(s) extending the invitation. If the exchangee is unable to pay all or part of the travel costs to and from the country of study, the Department of World Service will assume these. In addition it assumes the costs of health and accident insurance during the stay abroad.

### World Council of Churches

Scholarships for study abroad are being offered through the Scholarship Committee of the World Council of Churches for the academic year 1960-61 to:

young men and women preparing for full-time Christian service, who have already completed all or most of their basic theological training;

pastors and candidates for the ministry; persons preparing for other forms of full-time employment in the church or related organizations, provided they fulfill the necessary qualifications.

Scholarships are available for study in European and overseas countries such as Austria, France, Germany, Greece, Italy, the Netherlands, the Scandinavian countries, Switzerland (including the Graduate School

of Ecumenical Studies, Bossey), Turkey, United Kingdom, Canada, USA.

Applications for study in Africa, Asia, the Near East and other countries will also be considered.

All basic expenses of the students during their period of study abroad are covered by the scholarship. Travel expenses are to be covered, as far as possible, by the students themselves or their churches. The scholarships cover one academic year. Applicants must not be over 30 years of age.

The deadline for submitting applications varies from country to country. Further information may be obtained from the *Scholarship Committee, Department of Inter-Church Aid, World Council of Churches, 17 route de Malagnou, Geneva*. All applications are to be submitted through the national correspondents. The name of the correspondent for the applicant's country may also be obtained by writing the Scholarship Committee, Geneva.

A few fellowships for postgraduate study abroad are also available each year. Applicants must not be over 40 years of age. Preference is given to candidates in fields such as evangelism, social ethics and the urgent theological issues of the day. Applications for 1960-61 are to be submitted through national correspondents by the end of April, 1960. Fuller information is available from the Scholarship Committee, Geneva.



# FROM LANDS AND CHURCHES

## Germany

### Preview of the Munich Kirchentag

"YOU SHALL BE MY PEOPLE." With this as the theme, the ninth *Deutscher Evangelischer Kirchentag*, or Protestant Church Congress, will be held in Munich on August 12-16. In thus accepting the invitation of the bishop and executive board of the Lutheran church of Bavaria, the Kirchentag will be gathering for the first time in an area where Roman Catholics far outnumber Protestants. While it is true that the Bavarian Lutheran church with its 2.4 million members is one of the major member churches of the Evangelical Church in Germany (EKD), in Bavaria itself only every fifth person is Protestant. Lack of adequate meeting halls kept the leaders from realizing their original intention of holding the gathering in Nuremberg, the heart of the predominantly Protestant district of *Mittelfranken*. In Munich the first Protestant received his citizenship in 1801, and it was only 150 years ago that the first Protestant congregation came into being. Today over 200,000 of Munich's almost one million inhabitants are Protestant. To house the many guests numerous Roman Catholic families and institutions have offered accommodations, just as Protestants did for Roman Catholics attending the Catholic congress in Berlin last year and will presumably do again when the World Eucharistic Congress is held in Munich next year.

### What's in a Theme?

The theme of a Kirchentag is not derived from abstract speculation. It is the product of very concrete deliberation. The leaders of the Kirchentag and of the host church both have a hand in its production. They must take into account the relation of the theme both to the contemporary state of Protestantism and the Protestant church in Germany, and to the situation of the church in which the Kirchentag is to be held. Decisive in determining this year's theme was the question—expressed or unexpressed—addressed to Protestantism in Bavaria by its multifarious Roman Catholic environment as well as by the people of the worlds of science, literature and the arts in Munich and Upper Bavaria:

"Are you really a church? To what extent are you a church?"

The theme of a Kirchentag can hardly capture and express the totality of the biblical message. But if the theme starts with a central biblical motif, it leads through that particular aspect of the biblical message to the full message. This has been demonstrated repeatedly at the previous Kirchentags. The themes of the Kirchentag in Essen in 1950 ("Save Man!"), in Stuttgart in 1952 ("Choose Life"), in Hamburg in 1953 ("Abandon Not Your Trust") and in Frankfurt in 1956 ("Be Reconciled to God"), all had a soteriological accent. That of the Leipzig Kirchentag in 1954 ("Be Joyful in Hope") had an eschatological accent and that of 1957 ("The Lord, He is God; the Lord, He is God") when, in place of the regular congress which could not be held in Thuringia, regional and local Kirchentags were held in almost all member churches of the EKD, had a theological accent.

The theme of this year's gathering, "You Shall Be My People," shares an ecclesiological accent with the 1951 Kirchentag in Berlin ("We Are Brothers") and with the Evangelical Week in Hamburg in 1949 ("The Church on the Way") which was the starting point for the Kirchentags of the succeeding decade. The theme is stated thus only in Jer. 7:23, but in the form "They shall be my (his) people" it is also found in Jer. 24:7, 31:33, 32:38, Ezek. 37:23, 27, and Rev. 21:3. In the immediate context of all these passages stand also the words "I shall be your (their) God." The people of God and the church exist only because of the Lord; without him they are nothing.

This intimate union of God's promises and his commission permeates the Old and New Testament. To give to the church and the world a proper evangelical interpretation of the many ramifications of this fact will be the real goal at Munich. That goal precludes imposing national or clerical interpretations on the theme. One of the chief means toward achieving the goal is the direct proclamation of the word—in the sermon on Ex. 19:3-6 (cf. 1 Pet. 2:9) at the opening service, in the Bible studies on succeeding days (on Deut. 7:6-11, Jn. 15:1-17, Jn. 15:18-27) and in the sermons preached on Mk. 7:31-37, the gospel for the day (the 12th Sunday after Trinity), in the churches of Munich and vicinity and in most of the EKD.



## The Study Groups

The other means to the goal is the study groups where, as in the Evangelical Weeks and the Evangelical Academies, the gospel is brought to bear on modern life through discussion of various themes. Given the confession of Christendom that as head of the church Jesus Christ is at the same time Lord of the world and all its spheres of life (Col. 1:15-18, cf. also the *Barmen Declaration*, II), there must be clarified again and again what this Lordship of Christ means concretely and practically. Or, to put it in other words, what the obedience of faith, worked in the individual Christian and in the church through the hearing of the word, has to say and to do, concretely and practically, with regard to the questions and problems of the various spheres of life. As is well known, it is here that the Protestant church has its real difficulty. The same difficulty of interpreting the kingship of Christ is also more evident in Protestant ethics than it is in Protestant dogmatics. Hence it is all the more important that the Kirchentag should not bypass this difficulty. What would a Kirchentag be without the study groups? They should of course not be emphasized at the expense of the services of worship, the Bible studies, the celebration of Holy Communion, the home missionary efforts, the opportunities for private confession (introduced in Frankfurt in 1956) and for pastoral counseling (a new feature at this Kirchentag), the special programs for men, women and youth, the program for the churches in Asia and Africa, the evening for "Worldwide Christendom," the afternoon set aside for making and renewing personal acquaintances, the large closing rally (on Theresa Meadow in Munich), and the many cultural events. But the life of Christians and Christendom is a life lived, at one and the same time, in the gathering together of the congregation and in its dispersion in the world. That is to say, the faith worked by the hearing of the word when the congregation assembles for worship must realize itself in obedience and responsibility in the multitudinous situations of society; that is, in this ephemeral world which, like the church, is moving toward the consummation. Only when such obedience is realized is the widely prevalent schizophrenia of Protestant Christians overcome; and this, in the last analysis, is the *raison d'être* of the study groups.

The number of the groups and the subjects discussed in them follow no irrevocably fixed pattern. Here the Kirchentag is always "on the move." Preparation for the Munich study groups began at a conference in the fall of 1957 where principles were discussed. Then came the Kirchentag Congress in Hamburg in the spring of 1958 (with the theme "Reality in the Present-day"), followed by the conference called to discuss the themes, by the preparation and publication of the study document, the three meetings of the leaders of the study groups and the conference of the Bible study leaders. In the 10 study groups a different theme will be discussed on each of the three days set aside for study. There will be 55 speakers, half of them theologians and the other half laymen.

Corresponding to study groups at previous Kirchentags are the following:

### Study Group 5, *The Family*

Topics to be discussed: "Early Marriage," "A Bad Conscience while Raising Children," "Parents Accompany their Children into the Modern World"

### Study Group 6, *The State*

Topics: "The Basis and Boundaries of the Church's Political Responsibility," "Christians on Opposite Sides of the Political Fence," "Christians Shoulder their Political Responsibility"

### Study Group 7, *Economic Life*

Topics: "When Does Production Become an Idol?", "Insured—but Not Safe," "Production and Security"

Corresponding to the ecclesiological accent of the general theme and to the situation of the Lutheran church in Bavaria, Study Group 1 ("Church and Congregation" at previous Kirchentags) has been expanded into five groups:

### Study Group 1: *The Word*

Topics: "The Miracle: That God Speaks," "Why is Man so Silent?", "How May we Again Have a Voice?"

### Study Group 2: *The Congregation*

Topics: "Faith—How Attained?", "Congregations without Walls," "A Moribund Church"

### Study Group 3: *The Church*

Topics: "Must the Church be An Annoyance?", "Should the Church Have More Authority?", "The Power of Truth"



**Study Group 4: *The Diaspora***

Topics: "Must There be Different Churches?", "Roman Catholic Neighbors," "The One Church"

**Study Group 10: *The Ecumenical World***

Topics: "God, the Lord of the Whole Earth," "Are Asia and Africa our Concern?", "What is 'Mission' Today?"

Some of the above themes incorporate suggestions made at the Kirchentag Congress in Hamburg; the following topics came directly from the work of the congress:

**Study Group 8: *Man***

Topics: "Man—his Origin," "What is to Become of Man?", "What is our Future?"

**Study Group 9: *The Mass Media***

Topics: "Man under the Spell of Microphone and Camera," "From Spectators to Partners," "Make Use of the Opportunity"

This is not the place to discuss these 30 themes in detail, their relation to one another and to the main theme. This overview makes clear, however, the wide range of topics and their potential for stimulating discussion. Supplementing the study groups are two evening addresses on the themes "Sputnik and the Good Lord" and "What Must Christendom Take Account of in Modern Science?" Contemporary ideological debate is informed to a large extent by the interpretation given the findings of science and the achievements of technology, and the Christian community is frequently somewhat in the dark about what significance the words of the Bible have in this connection. The purpose of the two evening addresses and of the first topic in Study Group 8 is to offer those attending some expert advice on these questions and, second, to stimulate them to do further study of them in their parishes.

**Pan-German Encounter?**

Last but not least, this year's Kirchentag cannot overlook the fact that it is being held in Munich, once the bearer of the title "Capital of the Movement"—the movement which led the German people into catastrophe and brought so much suffering to other peoples. "You shall be my people," with the promise and commission contained therein, is for all who hear it a call to repentance and new life. That call is the primary concern when we Germans today speak of

our unrehabilitated past. In Munich this concern is to find expression in the evening program "Israel" (and we hope not only there), which has as themes "We Christians and the Jews" and "We Germans and the Jews."

The Kirchentag, this great gathering and presentation of postwar German Protestantism, unites in itself all elements of the Protestant church and gives them full and exemplary expression at the large meetings. The ecumenical significance attained by the Kirchentag is shown by the large number of visitors from Protestant churches in neighboring European countries and abroad. A special characteristic of previous Kirchentags has been the fact that Protestant Christians from both parts of a divided Germany here came together, met one another face to face, and united in testifying to their Christian faith. Whether that will again be true this year is at the time of writing still uncertain. If members of the Protestant churches in the German Democratic Republic are not able to come to Munich this year, the Kirchentag would, it is true, in a certain sense still be at one with the German people. But one of the major tasks of the Munich Kirchentag would then be to show that the pan-German encounter that characterized previous Kirchentags is not crucial to its life, but that it draws upon deeper sources.

FRIEDEBERT LORENZ

## *India*

### **Resumption of CSI—Lutheran Conversations**

AFTER 1956 there was a pause for about three years in the conversations between the Church of South India (CSI) and the Lutheran churches in South India (see *Lutheran World*, June 1958, p. 84 ff.). The work to unite these two denominations was not at a standstill, however, inasmuch as three theological conferences on the regional level were held in the meantime, one in Tamil at Madurai and two in Telugu at Bezvada. A desire on both sides for resuming the conversations of the Joint Theological Commission resulted in



a conference at Bangalore on April 14-16, 1959. It was convened with a view to reaching an agreement on the question of the nature of the church and the ministry.

A number of documents were placed before the commission.

(1) The Federation of Evangelical Lutheran Churches in India had submitted three questions to the CSI:

- (a) What is the meaning of the "historic episcopate"?
- (b) In what does the continuity of the ministry lie?
- (c) What constitutes the validity of the ministry?

The CSI's theological commission had sent an authorized reply, on certain points of which the Lutheran theological commission asked for further clarification. A final reply and an additional statement were then sent by the CSI. All these documents were before the joint commission.

(2) The CSI's theological commission submitted the following papers:

- (a) The Nature of the Church (Bishop A. M. Hollis)
- (b) The Visible Form of the Church's Unity (Bishop A. H. Legg)

(3) The Lutherans submitted the following papers:

- (a) The Relation of the Ministry to the Church (Dr. Martin L. Kretzmann)
- (b) Lutheran Approach to the Public Ministry in the Church (Pastor Herbert M. Zorn)
- (c) Episcopacy and Apostolic Succession (Dr. Sigfrid Estborn)

It became clear at the beginning that there was on both sides a strong desire to come to an understanding and to take a definite step forward. In three sessions a number of problems were discussed on the basis of the documents and papers presented, and details were clarified.

On the main issue, the historic episcopate, it was made clear beyond any doubt that on principle there exists no difference between the CSI and the Lutherans. The CSI has accepted the episcopate as necessary for the shepherding and extension of its congregations and as a useful means for the unification of its ministry. It does not hold it to be an essential element of the ministry of the church, nor does it hold episcopal ordination to be

essential for a valid ministry; nor does it consider the proclamation of the gospel and the administration of the sacraments by an episcopally ordained ministry more valid and efficacious than those by a ministry not standing in the historic episcopate. This it has demonstrated in practice by accepting the ministry of the non-episcopal churches that entered into the CSI as fully legitimate and valid, and by maintaining full fellowship and communion with all the churches from which they came. This latter principle is *not* subject to revision at the end of the thirty-year period when the decision will be made whether there will continue to be any exceptions to the general rule of an episcopally ordained ministry.

The Lutherans can accept the historic episcopate as one legitimate means of ordination, provided this in no way implies that the proclamation of the gospel and the administration of the sacraments by ministers thus ordained is looked upon as more valid and efficacious than that by pastors ordained by ministers not standing in episcopal succession. Some Lutheran churches have in fact preserved the unbroken episcopal consecration and ordination from the pre-Reformation church. Though they do not consider it an essential element of ordination they value it and want to maintain it because it forms a connecting link with past generations as well as with the episcopal churches in the present, and it has proved a helpful means for bringing the different churches together in the world.

The following statement on the nature of the church and the ministry was unanimously adopted by the Joint Theological Commission.

### An Agreed Statement on the Church and the Ministry

(1) The nature of the church and of the ministry within the church can only be understood rightly within the context of God's revelation of himself, his eternal saving purpose, his saving act in Jesus Christ his Son and the continuing saving work of the risen and ascended Christ through the Holy Spirit. The church exists by the grace of God and those who belong to it are members of the church by the grace of God.

(2) The church exists and men are called into the fellowship of the church in order that through it God may carry out his eternal



purpose in Christ (Eph. 3:9-11). It is a fellowship of men with God and with one another, in Christ. It is the fellowship of the Holy Spirit. As its heart is this fellowship with God; it is at its deepest a reality in the Spirit. We believe that it is God's will that men become members of the church through faith in the gospel and baptism into Christ (Eph. 2:8-10; John 3:5; Matt. 28:19-20). To be outside the church by unbelief or to be cut off from the church's fellowship because of unrepented sin is a serious matter. Yet, in the present state of disunity, no body of Christians can rightly claim to be in an exclusive sense the church or look upon its judgments as necessarily inspired by the Spirit.

(3) It is God's purpose that the church should be the place where he and his saving work in Christ are manifest. It is his will that the one, holy, catholic and apostolic church be seen in actual communities of human beings, baptized into Christ, to which he can make known his will and through which he can fulfill it (John 17:21). Because of the continuing fact of human sin, even in the redeemed, the church is not in any of its manifestations wholly obedient to the will of God. But the church of God in every place is called continually to turn to God, so that through its life Christ may be set forth.

(4) We not only speak of the church in the sense of the totality of all Christ's people, throughout all ages and all lands, who are one in him; and of the church as the local fellowship of believers who gather in one place. We also use the word "church" of the Christians in a region and of those Christians who belong to a particular denomination. Where such usage carries with it the implication that other Christians are not members of the church universal, it is not in accordance with the New Testament. We do well to recognize that the fundamental unity is God's gift in Christ and does in a real sense appear even where, owing to history, race or tradition, there are such wide divergencies in belief and practice among those calling themselves Christians that we cannot yet see any way towards visible unity consistent with loyalty to Christ and his truth. We should seek to discover and to develop this unity in our one Lord and to express it wherever we can in acts of obedience together. There is under the conditions of the world today need for Christians to discover and obey the will of God in and through a con-

tinuing fellowship which covers a wider area than any one local congregation. Where this fellowship, united in the word and the sacraments, is a manifestation of the presence of the Holy Spirit and an instrument of God's working, it may be called the church.

(5) The church is apostolic in its essential nature, in the sense that it shares in the mission of the Son by the Father and is empowered by the Holy Spirit (John 20:21-23). For the accomplishment of this total ministry to the world there is given by the Holy Spirit to every member of the church some form of ministering (1 Cor. 12). Every Christian, man and woman, has a charisma, a spiritual gift. It is an error to think that some members of the church are called to be active and others to be passive. Every member is meant both to give and to receive. The inter-related activity of the whole body of Christ is the revelation of the inter-related activity of the Triune God in his saving work for the universe. In relation to the world, out of which God has called his church, the whole church is a royal priesthood, in and through which Christ brings God to the world and the world to God. To be the church is to be a ministering community, because it is the body of Christ, who came "not to be ministered unto but to minister" (Mark 10:45).

(6) In order that through his church Christ may be made manifest to the world which he died to save, the quality of the relationship between every member of the church and Christ and of every member of the church one with another in Christ is vital. Therefore Christ has given to his church a ministry, in the special sense of persons set apart to perform certain functions within the fellowship, which are needed so that the church may worship God in thankful remembrance of his saving act in Christ and may witness for him to the world (Eph. 4:11-12). This pastoral office was given to the apostles at the first. There is a "watching over" the sheep and a "serving" of the sheep, *episkope* and *diakonia*. Both are found in Christ and both he entrusts to men (1 Pet. 5:1-4). We believe that the continuance of such a ministry is necessary to the full well-being and activity of the church everywhere and in all ages. We believe that by Christ's will it rests upon the church to determine, in dependence upon the Holy Spirit, how from time to time these functions of watching and serving shall be carried out. We see no reason to believe



that any one pattern of the Christian ministry has an exclusive claim to divine ordering and approval at all times and under all conditions. If we discern God at work within any body of Christians through a ministry of the word and the sacraments, we are bound to take this fact into account in any discussion about Christian unity.

(7) This ministry is within the church and is not to be thought of as possessing any independent relation to Christ of any authority which is not given by Christ in the church and for the life and work of the church. It is not the creation of the church and it is given to the church not to please the church but to do the will of Christ its Lord. It is the duty of the church to be alert to recognize that God has called this or that man to this special ministry, in whatever form, and to set him apart by prayer and, according to ancient custom, laying on of hands, to the office. At the heart of the work of the ministry must always be the preaching of the gospel and the administration of the sacraments, for it is in and through them that Christ constitutes and keeps alive his church.

(8) The essential continuity of the church is in the continued presence and activity of the Lord with the faithful. But, because the church's obedience is imperfect, the church has not continued perfectly "in love." The fellowship has been broken. Because of disunity among Christians, changes in the form, manner of ordination and functions of the ministry have been made without the approval of the whole church on earth at the time. It appeared to those responsible then, and appears to many today, that such action was inevitable unless they were to be false to the gospel. Yet, although we may agree that such changes may at times rightly be made, we must insist that they can only be justified if done prayerfully and with the widest possible approval of Christians, subject always to the absolute duty of loyalty to Christ and the gospel. God is a God of order, and we may not lightly change what we have inherited. Yet order itself may be made into an idolatry that turns men away from the living God. All remain under obligation to seek God's way for the restoration of unity in the Spirit.

(9) Every church makes rules for the selection and setting apart of men for the ministry and keeps a list of those whom it accepts as ministers within its fellowship. In the sense of obedience to its rules, validity

is an essential concept of any society. The error comes when we identify the rules of our church with the absolute will of God, and deny, implicitly or explicitly, that God accepts and uses some other form of the ministry equally with the form to which we are accustomed. It is not for us to determine how and where God can work.

(10) It is true that the personal exercise of oversight (*episkope*) was early entrusted by the church to one bishop in each area. This ordering was for many centuries universal, and is still the accepted form among the majority of Christians. We do not hold that it is essential for the existence of the church, or for the ministry and the sacraments; or that God has bound himself to grant through it greater blessing, authority or grace than through other forms of the church's ministry. It has been and can be grievously misused, as can every gift of God. But we see value in it as expressing through a person the oversight which is a vital part of the pastoral ministry within the church. The presence or absence of episcopacy, however, ought not by itself to determine the relationship of one church with another.

### Recommendations

As the Joint Theological Commission with this agreement had fulfilled the task entrusted to it in 1948, the following recommendations were made:

"Having arrived at an agreed statement on the church and the ministry, this Joint Commission regards its work as completed and resolves to reiterate its former judgment that the degree of doctrinal agreement between us is such as to warrant a closer fellowship than now exists between our churches. We, therefore, earnestly urge the churches to take action to secure such closer fellowship in practice.

"With this in view, we recommend that the Church of South India and the Lutheran churches appoint an inter-church commission with the following terms of reference:

"(1) To take steps to implement the proposals of the 1955 meeting of the Joint Theological Commission (pulpit and altar fellowship).

"(2) To prepare a catechism for use in the CSI and the Lutheran churches.

"(3) To organize regional conferences for further discussions on the church and the ministry.



"(4) To draw up a constitution with a doctrinal statement on the basis of the work already done by the Joint Theological Commission."

Thus an important stage of the negotiations for union had been brought to a fruitful end, and a new stage is to begin. The Joint Theological Commission dispersed by singing "Now thank we all our God."

SIGFRID ESTBORN

## *United States*

### **Religion on the Campuses**

FOR THE PAST SEVERAL YEARS an increased interest in the Christian faith, in the life of the church and in matters of religion has been apparent in the United States. It has affected not simply the Protestant community but also the Roman Catholic and Jewish communities. It has been frequently described as a religious revival. Some have hailed it as something good, while others have said that it is merely the USA equivalent of the global resurgence of non-Christian religions.

Those who describe it as the latter see in it a great danger for the Protestant churches. They would point to the heavy hand of the Madison Avenue advertising industry with its campaign slogans, "Go to Church"; "Look at the Windows of your Church or Synagogue from the Inside this Week"; and "Families Which Pray Together Stay Together." In addition these critics would point to the kind of national policy and governmental officialdom which speaks so readily of the value of faith and religion, apparently no matter what kind.

How has this "religious revival" shown itself in the universities and the multifarious kinds of institutions of higher learning? Has it had any positive contribution to make either to the churches or the academic community? What kind of critical evaluation is it now possible to make about the development?

But first a word about American higher education. The United States Office of Education includes nearly 1900 institutions of higher learning in its latest annual listing. Three and a half million students are enrolled

at these institutions. However, since the criteria for being listed is at least very broad, if not also vague, in this article we shall be talking about the (approximately) 900 four-year, accredited institutions granting degrees. This will include the large private universities such as Harvard, Yale, or Stanford; public or state universities such as the State University of Iowa or the Municipal University of Omaha; a broad category of technological institutions such as Texas College of Agriculture and Mechanical Arts, Carnegie Technological Institute, Colorado School of Mines, and the California School of Oceanography. Also included would be teachers training colleges and small liberal arts colleges.

Within this wide range of institutions we would find many that are considered private, meaning that they exist independently of financial support from either state, municipality, or church, which offers them a certain freedom in matters of religion. We would also find several hundred that were originally related to, and are perhaps still supported by, either the Protestant churches, or the Roman Catholic Church, or in a few cases by the Jewish community, and are therefore considered as having a positive attitude toward the Hebrew-Christian tradition. Among these there are nearly forty Lutheran institutions of higher learning, some of which now bear the name university.

The number of persons in attendance at these 900 institutions probably does not exceed two and a half million, many of whom are night students, or are otherwise enrolled on a less than full time basis. The actual number of full time students probably does not much exceed one and a half million.

### **I**

### **Religion in Life Week**

Out of the National Preaching Mission movement of the late 1930's and early 1940's there emerged a concern to carry on a concentrated evangelistic effort in the colleges and universities. It was a kind of mass evangelism with some concessions to the academic setting. In the Protestant colleges, which were affected neither by constitutional injunction nor religious pluralism, these week-long efforts became known as University Christian Missions. In the tax-supported colleges and universities, and where religious



pluralism was a factor, they soon came to be known as Religious Emphasis Weeks, and more recently as Religion in Life Weeks. Today, largely as a result of the religious revival, I would say, nearly every college or university sets aside one week a year which it designates as a Religion in Life Week.

During that week, religious spokesmen, either clergymen or leading laymen, are invited to enter classes to speak on the relation of their religious faith to the particular subject of study, e.g. "The Christian Heritage and English Literature." Special discussions are organized in the dormitories, fraternities, and sororities; these are usually led by members of the local clergy. Sometimes special mass meetings are also arranged at which specially invited speakers (almost always including a Protestant, Catholic and Jew) give addresses, make panel type presentations, or otherwise introduce religious discussions. The Sceptics' Hour, at which students can ask any questions they wish, has become a standard feature.

With the exception of some church-related colleges, and certain public universities in the south, these Religion in Life Weeks are, to all intents and purposes, inter-faith affairs, reflecting all the dangers of syncretism. The program of the weeks is usually interpreted as tri-faith in character, meaning that syncretism is supposedly avoided by granting full and separate recognition to Protestantism, Roman Catholicism and Judaism, and sometimes also granting a platform for Eastern Orthodoxy, Hinduism, Islam and Buddhism. But in practice this distinction usually breaks down. Planning committees for these weeks would normally find it difficult to secure agreement on the names of speakers of the neo-orthodox variety. They will more likely settle for a person who will assert that there are great spiritual values in the Hebrew-Christian tradition. Men who speak of faith as ultimate concern are, if they do not become too intellectual, also quite acceptable.

In most instances the interest in holding a week-long affair of such dubious character derives neither from the students, nor from the leaders of the various religious communities, but from the college or university administrative offices. One suspects that the motivation is in many cases derived from the college administration's desire for good public relations. In other cases administrations seem to be going along with the national campaign (with its nationalistic tendencies) to foster the idea that religion, almost no matter what kind,

is good. One also suspects that some presidents of state universities have found it helpful to be able to say to tax-appropriation committees of state legislatures that their institution is obviously not "God-less" but is really concerned with the good and God-filled life.

On the positive side, there are many instances where top flight theologians have been able to challenge deeply both students and faculty to see some of the deeper issues confronting man and the intellectual enterprise today. The more intellectually minded at church-related colleges, however, frequently denigrate the religious emphasis week in such institutions. One professor is fond of saying, "What this college needs is not a religious emphasis week, but rather a religious de-emphasis week." Among students, and particularly among the Protestant clergy, these weeks are referred to as "Nod-to-God" Week. They arouse no high hopes in the clergy. Worse yet, since all such ventures require some kind of inter-Protestant cooperation, from which it is almost impossible to abstain, and frequently also a spurious kind of inter-faith accord, the impression is inadvertently given that this is what ecumenism means. This, of course, irritates all those who are truly concerned about the ecumenical movement of renewal, while it in no way challenges those who are opposed to everything purporting to be ecumenical.

## II

### The Teaching of Religion

One of the possibly more positive and hopeful results of the recrudescence of interest in religion in the US lies in the area of teaching. In the church colleges some courses have almost always been offered in the Bible, church history, Christian ethics and introductory courses to Old and New Testament theology. This has probably also been true of many, but by no means all, of the private colleges and universities.

In the public universities, however, historically the situation has been quite different. Officials of these institutions have usually held that the US constitution could not be construed to permit this. Consequently the Bible, for example, was studied only for its Elizabethan English and for its literary values. In some places courses would be offered in Comparative Religion, and the Psychology and Philosophy of Religion. These courses would be offered



either in the Department of Philosophy or, where one existed, in the Department of Religion. More frequently religion and philosophy would be incorporated into one single department giving main emphasis to moral philosophy.

Since the end of the second world war there has been an increasing willingness on the part of administrations and faculties of many public colleges and universities to permit a more forthright approach to the teaching of religion. As a result we now find a score or more of Schools of Religion which have been established either as an organic part of the university, or in a very close relation to the university and enjoying its official sanction. The courses offered are given university accreditation. In addition, many universities have agreed to the establishing of chairs of religion, of Bible, of theology, etc. In many more universities, the courses offered in religion have been increased, enriched in variety, and given more substantial intellectual content. At one such School of Religion the dean claims that no less than 10 per cent of the student body is regularly enrolled in courses in the school.

Several factors, quite apart from the religious revival, have made this development possible. First of all, certain contemporary theologians—Niebuhr and Tillich, for example—have had a very strong effect upon the intellectuals in the universities. Particularly they have succeeded in getting theology to be taken more seriously as an intellectual discipline with a validity of its own and meriting greater attention in the university. Secondly, since the end of the second world war there has been widespread concern about the nature and function of the university. In this conversation the student Christian movements, and notably the denominational leaders of these, have played an important role. In many cases such works as the World's Student Christian Federation's Greybook by Professor John Coleman, *The Task of the Christian in the University*, or Sir Walter Moberley's report of the British Student Christian Movement's studies entitled *The Crisis in the University*, have been introduced to the academic community by the student Christian movements through faculty-student discussion groups. Thirdly, in the student Christian movements a greater effort has been made to take the intellectual enterprise more seriously. As a result some of the younger members of the teaching staff now are persons who were

introduced to thinking seriously as Christians about some of these issues while they were students. With some of them, the student Christian movements have succeeded in abolishing the idea that Christianity is only a disguised, pietistic moralism, devoid of any communicable cognitive content. Even so, this notion, that Christianity is really only a pious morality, continues to be the real reason why so many members of college and university faculties refuse to allow the introduction into the curriculum of substantial courses in the Christian faith.

It should also be reported that in some places where the university officials continue to be intractable on the constitutional question, some of the Protestant denominations have sought to offer courses in the Christian faith on a non-accredited basis. This non-accredited teaching program they have wisely sought to carry on at a level of competence at least equivalent to that of the normal university offering. In order to do this, the university pastors have had to be selected from among the best educated of the clergy. Since most of the American clergy continues to come not from universities but from church colleges this has posed a problem. But the placing of more competent clergy to work in the universities has had very good results, notably in working with members of the teaching staff, international students, and post-graduate students. And the non-credit teaching courses have been sought out by a fair number of serious minded students, many of whom were non-Christians.

In spite of this rather gratifying development, the fact remains that the large majority of both students and teachers remain totally uninvolved in the development and unaffected by it. No one could seriously argue that the greater interest at some universities in more competent teaching is evidence of a religious revival. For many of the teachers, and surely the majority belongs to a church, the Christian faith can only lay claim to a very small portion of their time. They will go to church on Sunday. Others may be quite deeply immersed in church-sponsored activities, but even then the Christian faith seems rather more like an interesting social convention than something which asserts a claim over the whole of life. There would not be many who would openly admit to believing that Jesus Christ is Lord of all, if that were to include the processes of the intellect. Most teachers and students seem to keep their Christian faith in a separate



compartment, well sealed off from their intellectual discipline and their daily life. The religious revival has probably tended to make silence the better part of valor, but one needn't look far to find both cultured and uncultured despisers of God, the Christian faith, and the church.

### III

#### The Student Christian Movements

The United States has never had a unitary Student Christian Movement such as is found in so many other countries. From about 1870 until 1920, however, the student YMCA and YWCA each had branches in most of the accredited four-year colleges and universities, some of which were combined into a single Christian Association. While the origins of denominational student societies (variously known as fellowships, associations, clubs) go back to the beginning of the century, the real development of denominational concern did not take place until after the first world war, with the bulk of the development taking place only since the second world war.

The Lutheran Student Association of America was formally organized in 1922, and thus became the first intercollegiate denominational student association organized on a national basis. Since the second world war the National Lutheran Council has established an agency for the purpose of developing a strong Lutheran ministry in and to the academic community. It has established Lutheran student centers in approximately 50 of the universities with the largest Lutheran enrollments, and has plans for expanding to other situations as funds become available and the size of the Lutheran constituency grows to warrant a student center. In about 80 places it employs pastors or women counselors to devote exclusive attention to work with students, teachers and administrative officers. In addition, Lutheran Student Associations are to be found in approximately three hundred other colleges and academic institutions; here the associations depend for senior leadership upon members of the teaching staff, or more generally, the clergymen of nearby Lutheran congregations.

This very brief account of the development of Lutheran work is characteristic of the way all the more sizeable Protestant denominations function. The strategy has involved very

large capital investments for student centers, the establishment of a foundation consisting of persons appointed by the parent ecclesiastical body to whom the foundation is responsible, the employment of staff, and an increasing expression of confessional cohesion on a national basis. In this rather loose way then we speak of these several national efforts, or intercollegiate societies, as student Christian movements.

By the mid 1930's denominational work was sufficiently well developed so that efforts were begun to relate all of these ventures to one another. At first, some of the churches officially cooperated with each other and with the YMCA and YWCA to make a unitive witnessing community a reality in as many places as possible. But this effort never went very far. The idea was then born of trying at least to relate these various efforts to each other in one national expression of inter-Christian solidarity including the YMCA and YWCA. After protracted planning the United Student Christian Council was brought into being in 1944. It was organized as a federation of nine denominational student organizations, the student YMCA and YWCA, the Interseminary Movement and the Student Volunteer Movement.

In the ensuing years the growth of denominationally derived and oriented work among students has been very considerable, while relative to the whole the work of the YMCA and YWCA has been more static. The number of professionally employed clergy and lay secretaries of these members of USCC reaches approximately 1000, and if those employed by the non-cooperating Southern Baptist Convention, Lutheran Church-Missouri Synod, and the Inter-Varsity Christian Fellowship is added, the total reaches approximately 1500. Associated with the USCC member movements are at least 3000 campus associations, approximately half of which have some professional leadership.

Reports from campuses indicate that in a few places approximately 80 per cent of the Christian population is regular in attending Sunday church services. Other campuses report the figure to be no higher than 20 per cent, and the large majority of campuses put the figure somewhere between 35 and 50 per cent. When one enquires how many of these also participate in the rest of the program of the student Christian movements only a very few places would give a figure higher than 20 per cent, and most say that not more



than 10 per cent of their constituency is involved in any substantial way.

Several comments about the work of the denominations may be helpful in assessing the significance of the development over the past 20 to 30 years.

First, most of the formal work of the denominations began as part of a strategy to stem the high rate of church defection among students, which was a problem particularly in the 1920's and 1930's. Many of the hundreds of denominational student centers were conceived of as a religious home away from home, which philosophy prevailed down through the mid 1940's. The thesis "The Church Follows its Students," as set forth by Dr. Clarence Shedd, was an uncomfortably accurate description of denominational response to the discovery that already by 1930 less than 30 per cent of Christian students were attending church colleges, and an ever increasing number were to be found in the "godless" non-church colleges and universities. But the strategy of seeking to conserve the students for life in the church began to give way in the 1940's. Slowly the ecumenical and more missionary point of view of the World's Student Christian Federation asserted itself. Denominations changed from a "holding" strategy to a more aggressive and evangelically invested strategy. The student Christian movement was not to be conceived merely as a society for comforting mothers distraught about Johnny's attendance at a secular university. Gradually the denominations came to see that they had a responsibility extending beyond their own denominational constituency and embracing the whole academic community, including not simply American undergraduates, but also international students, graduate students, faculty and administration.

Second, with the shift from thinking almost exclusively of serving a denominational constituency to the view of addressing the whole academic community, a shift also took place in the kind of programs that were planned. Where the program had been largely built around recreational fellowship, it was supplanted by a more substantial approach, including an increasing emphasis upon study in small groups. Libraries began to be added to student centers, often replacing the ping-pong table. Recreation leaders were replaced with more intellectually and evangelically serious staff. Work with faculty members was begun, which was eventually to

lead to the formation nationally of the Faculty Christian Fellowship, and to the excellent quarterly publication *The Christian Scholar*. In USCC a study department was set up to prepare the needed study materials, and USCC spearheaded a move to convert the large number of "inspirational" intercollegiate student conferences into "study" conferences.

Third, with the aforementioned shift from constituency to community orientation, or at least where the shift was actually made, the several denominational and "Y" student groups existing on the larger campuses had to take each other more seriously into account. The result was not an unmixed blessing. While many students for the first time were thereby introduced to the ecumenical movement, it often resulted in seeking for shallow solutions such as campus student Christian councils which sought only to coordinate programs but were not able to bind the Christian student groups into a vital ecumenical community of witness. The Life and Mission of the Church project begun two years ago by the World's Student Christian Federation, however, has already had a salutary effect in redirecting some Christian student groups from worrying about organizational superstructures toward more serious thought about the essential nature and task of the church in the world and about the need for ecumenical renewal. During this past year, as a direct consequence of the project, the USCC member movements made a serious effort to carry on an intensified Bible study program on the different campuses while engaging thousands of students in intercollegiate study conferences on the biblical understanding of the missionary calling of the church.

Fourth, one further consequence of all this has been a progressively growing dissatisfaction with all national structures, including both the denominational and the interdenominational kind. Four of the denominational societies are now in the final stages of ending their separate existences by merging into an interdenominational United Campus Christian Fellowship. The four student movements are those associated with the United Presbyterian Church, the Disciples of Christ, the United Church of Christ, and the Evangelical United Brethren. Their reason for merging is in no small measure their disappointment over the fact that other members of USCC did not want it to become a fully united student Christian movement



but only a coordinating council with severely restricted functions.

In addition, there has been a decision to merge the United Student Christian Council, the Student Volunteer Movement, and the Interseminary Committee into a new organization replacing the former three. The new organization will be known as the National Student Christian Federation. While it will resemble in many respects the former USCC, it will seek to do something a little different. It will seek to bind together into an effective ecumenical community not only the student Christian movements but also the church boards of home and foreign missions and the official church agencies for college and university work. It is hoped that in this organization sufficient strength will be found to help develop a stronger witnessing community in the colleges and universities, one which will also take the ecumenical more seriously. Whether it will be more capable than USCC of helping to develop more adequate work in the several hundred smaller colleges remains to be seen. But the concentration upon denominationally derived and oriented work is only possible (given the limited resources) within a few of the larger universities, and in many of the smaller places hardly anything at all is being done.

### A Greater Openness

The net effect of the religious revival on US colleges and universities is difficult to judge. Superficial evidence such as the Religion in Life Weeks, church attendance, and the official attitude of many, but not anywhere near all, college administrative offices, would suggest a fairly extensive influence. But the situation is not so unambiguous. Except perhaps at Sunday worship there has been no increase in the per cent of students participating in the life of the student Christian movements. At the same time, within the student Christian movements the Christian faith is no longer seen only as a kind of pious fellowship of like-minded and relatively good students. Increasingly it has been acquiring a more serious, biblically grounded character. Even so, all but a very small percentage of students, however faithful they may have been in Sunday School and church attendance, have been shown to be virtual illiterates in biblical understanding of the Christian faith. While percentage wise the student Christian movements seem to be

standing still, the Inter-Varsity Christian Fellowship has been growing by leaps and bounds all over the nation, and today probably has more local branches than any single denominational society.

As far as the effect upon the universities are concerned, perhaps the most that can be said is that today there is an openness toward the Christian faith and the churches, which was not there in the same degree prior to the end of the second world war.

HERLUF M. JENSEN

## Finland

### Sobornost and the Churches

IN MAY OF THIS YEAR the Christian Council of Finnish Churches, in cooperation with the Ecumenical Institute in Bossey (near Geneva), conducted a conference which brought Finnish Lutherans, Finnish Orthodox and members of Finnish free churches together with representatives of the Russian Orthodox church, the Lutheran church of Estonia and members of the staff of the Ecumenical Institute. It was the first conference of this kind.

Most people are aware that there is in Finland an autocephalic Orthodox church. While it is small in numbers (about 72,000 members) it exhibits a good deal of life. Within the church there is a group of theologians very much interested in ecumenical contacts.

This church and the Finnish Lutheran church have in recent years, through theological discussions, come into closer contact; the other Christian churches of Finland have also evinced an interest in contacts of this kind. Already last year (1958), with the cooperation of the Ecumenical Institute, a number of conferences were held at the Church Institute in Järvenpää near Helsinki, in which representatives of the Lutheran and Orthodox churches of Finland discussed theological themes and questions relating to their life alongside one another.

For a long time, however, there has been a desire to extend the new contacts between



the Finnish churches to the neighboring churches in Russia. The presence of Professor Uspenski of the Theological Academy in Leningrad and Dr. Talysin of the Theological Academy in Moscow (i.e. representatives of the Russian Orthodox church) and of Archbishop Kiivit of the Lutheran church in Estonia, gave the conference this year its special stamp. Also taking part in the meeting were one representative each of the Baptist and Methodist churches in Finland. The theme was: "The Catholicity (*Sobornost*) of the Church."

The concept of *sobornost*, so characteristic of Orthodox theology, was approached from various angles. Prof. Uspenski approached it primarily through the theology of the church fathers, Dr. Talysin more with a view to questions of ecclesiastical law and practical theology. Dr. Nissiotis of the Bossey staff and a member of the Orthodox church of Greece gave a highly interesting outline of a theology of *sobornost* in its cosmic dimensions. Prof. Nikolainen of the theological faculty of Helsinki discussed the problem of the unity of the church in the light of the New Testament. Prof. Wolf, director of the Ecumenical Institute, gave an introduction to the ecumenical debate on the unity of the church; and Dr. Sundqvist of the Baptist church in Finland spoke on "*Sobornost* and the Free Churches."

In the lengthy discussions that followed it became evident that the dialogue between the various confessions revealed many new ways of seeing the question of the catholicity of the church in a new light. That meant at the time creating a basis for churches of various confessions, in the whole of their life, to move into a new relation to one another.

The conference produced a resounding echo among the Finnish people, and it is to be assumed that the first meeting of this kind will result in further encounters, perhaps not only between theologians. Readiness to take part in such future meetings was expressed by all the participants.

Thanks are due especially to Prof. Nikolainen and to the directors of the Church Institute in Järvenpää, Dr. A. Siiraala and Miss Inga-Brita Castrén, for working so effectively to help bring the conference about. We would hope that they might succeed in forming, especially among Finnish Lutherans, a group of pastors and theologians which would regard as its task the continuation of this work and the careful preparation of new encounters. That would be a task which would be of significance beyond the bounds of the Finnish and Russian churches—in the Christian church throughout the world.

HANS HEINRICH WOLF



## BOOK REVIEWS

### *Hymnology, 1950-1959*

#### I

HANDBUCH ZUM EVANGELISCHEN KIRCHENGESANGBUCH. Edited by Christhard Mahrenholz and Oskar Söhngen, in collaboration with O. Schliske. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck and Ruprecht.

Volume I, 1: WORT- UND SACHKONKORDANZ. Compiled by F. J. Arnold, C. Mahrenholz, O. Schliske, R. Utermöhlen. 2nd ed., 1956. 264 pp.

Volume II, 1: LEBENSBIlder DER LIEDERDICHTER UND MELODISTEN. Based on a manuscript by O. Michaelis, prepared for publication by W. Lueken. 1957. 300 pp.

Volume II, 2: GESCHICHTE DES KIRCHENLIEDES (by P. Gabriel) and GESCHICHTE DER MELODIEN DES EVANGELISCHEN KIRCHENGESANGBUCHES (by W. Blankenburg). 1957. 121 pp.

Special Volume: DIE LIEDER UNSE-  
RER KIRCHE: Eine Handreichung zum  
Evangelischen Kirchengesangbuch. By J. Kulp.  
Edited and prepared for publication by A. Büch-  
ner and S. Fornacon. 1958. 642 pp.

Volume III: LIEDERKUNDE (in prepa-  
ration).

Volume IV: QUELLENVERZEICHNIS,  
ORTSVERZEICHNIS, GENERALREGI-  
STER (in preparation).

Of the many events in the history of the German church in the 20th century, two of the more important are the publication of the *Evangelisches Kirchengesangbuch* (EKG) in 1950—used by the whole Evangelical Church in Germany—and the *Agende für Evangelisch-Lutherische Kirchen und Gemeinden* (*Agende I*) in 1955. Not since the Reformation have liturgical books exercised such an influence and reached so many people. They are worship books of the first order, holding out much promise for the life of the German Protestant church, and destined to give the church the framework and the vehicle for expressing and testifying to its faith. The antecedents of the books lie in decades of scholarly research, in a sifting of the

church's confessions of its faith in the past, and a reassessment of the abiding values of the church. This requires no special proof. Hymnals and agendas are always testimonies of life and faith. To make proper use of them always requires new interpretation, since in them there is an encounter with the history of the church and its confessions of faith. Through its hymnals and agendas the church illuminates its history and reaches back to the fathers—thus creating for itself a new history. Hence, hymnals and agendas are always open to the future and the past. And research and scholarship assume the burden of making the past intelligible to the present and opening the door to the present and the future. Scholarship fulfills its task only when it is critical, when it offers guidance and points to the future. Thus it is related to the present, and to the work of the minister and the musician. This practical requirement the four volumes of the *Handbuch zum Evangelischen Kirchengesangbuch* attempt to fulfill. On the whole, they have proved to be a major source of help to the scholar, the parish minister and the congregation.

That is true in the first instance of the concordance of words and subjects. It makes possible a comprehensive view of the doctrinal content of the hymns, and of the relation between them and the Bible. The biblical content of a hymn is always the most important criterion of its value. A good concordance which assists in this evaluation is therefore of inestimable value, and this concordance falls in that category. This kind of study of the biblical and doctrinal content of hymns is indispensable, seeing that the hymn continues to be the most effective way in which the worshipping congregation testifies to its faith.

Always an important question is the selection of hymns for the service. The hymn has a place in the liturgy, and a function in the service. Hence consideration of the liturgical use of the hymn is essential. In a rather long sketch of "The Hymn in the Service of Worship," R. Utermöhlen gives a selection of hymns for the beginning of the service and following the sermon, for the offertory, the distribution of Holy Communion, baptism, confession and weddings; the hymns for the gradual are fixed. The hymns suggested cover all Sundays, festival



days, and saints' days. The selection is a helpful and stimulating one.

Concluding the volume is an outline, by Christhard Mahrenholz, of the construction of the hymns, based on an analysis of the metrical construction of the text which in most cases coincides with the rhythm of the hymn tune. The essay arranges the hymns according to the number of lines (two to sixteen lines).

Volume II, 1, *Lebensbilder der Liederdichter und Melodisten*, gives biographical sketches of the writers and composers of all the hymns in the EKG. It follows the chronological and geographical arrangement of the appendix to the EKG. The sketches have a scholarly foundation; they are set off from older presentations by the inclusion of a great deal of new material gathered from the sources. Some things future research will still have to clarify. The scholar will note how much progress hymnological research has made in recent decades, but also how many things are still in flux. Of particular value are the books and source material listed at the end of each biography. Next to the new scholarly findings the volume contains, its chief value lies in the way it brings out how each of the hymn stanzas or tunes are an expression both of the faith of the individual and the church. A reading of the description of the intellectual, theological, artistic and social environment of the writers and composers gives one new eyes and ears for the hymns. It is often moving to discover to what extent a great number of the hymns in the hymnal were written in distress and sorrow, and how it almost seems there is spiritual blessedness only in trial and temptation. To a great extent, the hymnal is a book of martyrs and saints, and this impression is one of the most important results of reading this volume. It can perhaps contribute to fostering a different attitude to the church's confession of faith in song, perhaps helping us to approach our hymns with greater respect and reverence. For the pastor, the teacher of religion and for congregations, this book too is an excellent aid.

The first part of Volume II, 2, is a sketch of "The History of the Hymn" by P. Gabriel. The scholar will of course not be satisfied with a presentation which attempts to cover so much ground in 40 pages, but for the student, teacher and Christian layman, the essay will serve as an introductory survey

of the subject, to be followed by further study. For the most part, the author has successfully accomplished his task, and the thorough knowledge of the facts which permeates the narrative style is one of the reasons. A welcome feature of the essay is that the author selects certain areas and concentrates on these.

The second part of the book, a first attempt at "A History of the Hymn Tunes in the *Evangelisches Kirchengesangbuch*," by W. Blankenburg, seeks to fill a noticeable gap in hymnology. This study too, extending over 76 pages, is intended only as an outline, and is more in the nature of a sketch. The musicologist knows how much uncertainty there is about the origin of hymn tunes, and how many unanswered questions remain. Almost all of the tunes in the *Gesangbuch* have behind them a history of several centuries, during which time they underwent changes in structure. Reflected in these changes are changes in the style of music, in the relation between words and music, the singing habits of congregations, in fact our attitude to singing and music in general. When one considers all these questions and those related to taste and the history of thought as well, then it becomes apparent what a mass of material the historian has to work through in order to arrive at comprehensive and valid results. Research here is still in its infancy.

Taking this difficult situation into account, Blankenburg's essay seeks to analyze the structure of the hymn tunes as represented by examples from the Wittenberg circle of composers, from the Bohemian and Moravian Brethren, from Strasbourg and Geneva, from the first and second halves of the 17th century, and from Pietism. He tries to set forth the origins of the tunes and the development they underwent, their relation to *Volkslieder* (as seen in the framework of the history of music in general), and especially the relation between words and music. It becomes clear how greatly the inner vitality of the tunes has shrunk and their power of expression has waned over the course of centuries, where melody and text no longer really correspond to one another, or no longer stand in a dialectical relation to one another. Blankenburg's study should be of interest particularly to church musicians.

*Die Lieder unserer Kirche* is of special importance. It contains 394 hymn monographs arranged in the same order as the hymns in the EKG. Careful work has gone into the



monographs. They make clear that each hymn is a work of art in itself. Study of the volume is an exciting task, one which brings the reader into a new relation to the hymnal. One is struck by the way in which the total corpus of hymns of the German speaking churches of the Reformation constitutes not only a remarkable canon of Christian witness but a monument of Western culture of the first rank.

Each monograph contains

- (1) information on the origin of texts and tunes, date of composition, antecedents, later changes, different versions and exact reference to sources;
- (2) an analysis of form (particularly of metrical construction) which places the hymn in the context of the poet's work as a whole;
- (3) an analysis of the text, taking account of the biblical and theological content, language and the cultural and theological circumstances and drawing upon the writers' own words as well as other historical documents;
- (4) a discussion of the liturgical place of the hymns in the service of worship in the past and present.

At the end of the book are a number of indexes—of sources, pertinent literature, persons, places, first lines of hymns, tunes and texts. One can thus examine with little effort not only the work of the poets and musicians but the importance of individual towns and geographical areas as well. This makes the volume even more valuable.

The authors ask the readers to pass on to them comments, criticism and corrections. These they will no doubt receive in the course of time. In the meantime we stress the fact that this is an important book.

## II

**DAS DEUTSCHE EVANGELISCHE KIRCHENLIED.** By Paul Gabriel. 3rd ed. Berlin: Evangelische Verlagsanstalt, 1956. 156 pp., 29 plates.

**DIE CHRISTOLOGIE IN LUTHERS LIEDERN.** By Klaus Burba. Gütersloh: C. Bertelsmann, 1956. 72 pp.

**DIE CHRISTVERKÜNDIGUNG IM WEIHNACHTSLIED UNSERER KIRCHE.** By Karl Hauschildt. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck and Ruprecht, 1952. 232 pp.

**BAROCK UND AUFKLÄRUNG IM GEISTLICHEN LIED.** Marburg/Lahn: Verlag Hermann Rathmann, 1951. 241 pp.

**THEOLOGIE UND FRÖMMIGKEIT IM DEUTSCHEN EVANGELISCH-LUTHERISCHEN GESANGBUCH DES 17. JAHRHUNDERT UND FRÜHEN 18. JAHRHUNDERT.** By Ingeborg Röbbelen. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck and Ruprecht, 1957. 470 pp.

**PAUL GERHARDT, DICHTUNGEN UND SCHRIFTEN.** Edited by Eberhard von Cranach-Sichart. Munich: Verlag Paul Müller, 1957. 522 pp.

**HULDIGUNG FÜR PAUL GERHARDT.** By Kurt Ihlenfeld. Berlin: Verlag Merseburger, 1957. 182 pp.

**DAS EVANGELISCHE KIRCHENGESANGBUCH: Ein Bericht über seine Vorgeschichte, sein Werden und die Grundsätze seiner Gestaltung.** By Christhard Mahrenholz. Kassel and Basel: Bärenreiter Verlag, 1950. 117 pp.

Wilhelm Nelle's *Geschichte des Evangelischen Kirchenliedes* (third edition, 1928) has long been out of print, and it has been 50 years or more since the last comprehensive histories of the hymn were written. All the more reason for rejoicing therefore that 25 years after its first appearance P. Gabriel's *Das Deutsche Evangelische Kirchenlied* has now appeared in an expanded, third edition. That there is no large, comprehensive history of Protestant hymns must not be interpreted as a sign of stagnation in hymnological research. The reason is to be sought rather in the difficulty of summarizing the plethora of material concisely and conscientiously. An added burden is the fact that a history of the *Evangelisches Gesangbuch* has also never been written, although a number of monographs have appeared recently. These only serve to draw attention to the remaining lacunae however.

The two books by BURBA and HAUSCHILDT, both christological studies, remind us that hymnology is not primarily a branch of German philology or of musicology. It is rather a discipline which grows out of the soil of theology and approaches its subject matter with theological questions. Interesting in Burba's work is his development of the significance of baptism in Luther's hymns.



Hauschildt, on the other hand, develops his christological studies as a hermeneutical problem, limiting himself to Christmas hymns, but tracing them from their very beginnings down to the present. He begins therefore with New Testament *cantica* and biblical hymns, turns then to the Christmas hymns in the ancient church and the Middle Ages down through the Reformation, and concludes by examining the hymns in Orthodoxy, Pietism, the Enlightenment and the present. Part two is a theological and systematic study of the proclamation of Christ in the Christmas hymns. Inquiring into the formative principles of that proclamation, the author cites as especially significant the Bible, the liturgy, art, customs and the personality of the poet.

A special reason for gratitude is that hymnological research, after reserving almost all its devotion for the 16th century, is now turning its attention to the 17th century as well. German philology has always appreciated the importance of the Christian lyric poetry of the 17th century, from Opitz on, and has made quite thorough study of it. By concentrating their research and editorial efforts on the 17th century, musicologists have helped to make of it something like a golden age of Protestant church music. In the history of Christian piety Paul Gerhardt and his contemporaries have occupied the places of honor. There is a good deal of truth in all of this.

But one must not overlook the fact that a critical view of the 17th century also shows that, in the course of time, our conceptions have become distorted at many places and that some of our perspectives have been skewed, and certain things falsely or over-emphasized. A theological study of the period which takes account of the history of theology and places the hymn in the context of the life and thought of the 17th century is all the more necessary, therefore. Only then shall we see clearly the extent to which the whole baroque period is of an antithetical nature, and the extent to which the baroque man, despite and because of his passionate strivings for harmony in life and art, remained schizophrenic in his thinking and manner of life. The influence of a deistic nature philosophy, the transformation of world view, the generally underestimated significance of mysticism, symbolism, the new conception of piety, with its emphasis on experience—these are all things of which

exact account must be taken if one desires to come to a real understanding of the hymn.

As an attempt at a cultural interpretation of the flowering of Christian lyric poetry, KURT BERGER's book is an interesting introduction to the subject. INGEBORG RÖBBELEN, on the other hand, examines the theology of the hymns of the 17th century (including the Enlightenment). It is noteworthy that the author approaches the problem via the hymn book and its history.

Miss Röbbelen's book shows how the format and arrangements of the hymnals of that period reflect the structure of Orthodox dogmatics. The first part of the book is a very thorough history of the hymnals of the 17th and early 18th century, seen as a reflection of the theology and piety of that day. Part two discloses the relations of the hymns to the literature and thought of the day, while part three approaches the hymnals through the dogmatic *loci* of repentance, justification and the Christian life. It is interesting to find how "Lutheran" the contents of the hymnals of the 17th century remained, and how through the singing of the congregation "sound doctrine" exercised a watchman's role in the sometimes extremely disparate forms of Christian life. One sees on the other hand how, in order to avoid slow but certain death, the new currents which had fashioned a place for themselves in Pietism forced their way out of the increasingly confining doctrinal structure of Orthodoxy. The author should perhaps have dwelt at greater length on the fact that Pietism, as an inevitable phenomenon in the history of theology and piety, would some day knock on the gates of Orthodoxy.

The book also takes too little account of the great importance of the First Article and eschatology. It was precisely in the baroque period that the last major attempt was made to apprehend the cosmos and to see heaven and earth as one (cf. e.g. the church architecture, or the organs of the period with their angels adding their music to that of the organ).

Miss Röbbelen's book is one no hymnologist can afford to bypass. The sections on Paul Gerhardt especially make it a fitting accompaniment to the edition of Gerhardt's complete hymns and writings, published in 1957 with a lengthy introduction by EBERHARD VON CRANACH-SICHART. K. Ihlenfeld's *Huldigung für Paul Gerhardt* is a fine appreciation of Gerhardt's life, hymns and writings.



How important all the aforementioned publications are the reader will discover not only as he actually uses the EKG but also from Christhard Mahrenholz's *Das Evangelische Kirchengesangbuch*. The book relates the prehistory of the EKG, tells how it came into being, and the principles that guided its creators; it explains further the reasoning behind the selection and arrangement of hymns, the scope of the book and the versions of the texts and hymn tunes. It is in addition an important contribution to research in the history of the hymnal.

### III

JAHRBUCH FÜR LITURGIK UND HYMNOLOGIE. Vol. I, 1955; Vol. II, 1956; Volume III, 1957. Edited by Konrad Ameln, Christhard Mahrenholz and Karl Ferdinand Müller. Kassel: Johann Stauda Verlag.

It is impossible to take account here of all the hymnological publications of recent years (the hymnological research of the Swiss Reformed church should receive separate treatment sometime). It would be a noticeable gap, however, if we should fail to call attention to the *Jahrbuch für Liturgik und Hymnologie* which has been appearing since 1955. Devoted exclusively to research in hymnology and the history of the liturgy, the *Jahrbücher* have already published a number of major essays, bringing to light hitherto unknown historical sources, reproduced in excellent facsimile. We might mention here especially the facsimile of the entire *Achtliederbuch* of 1524. Of particular importance are the large number of shorter articles and miscellaneous reports carrying forward research on specific problems. Finally the comprehensive bibliographical articles covering almost all German and foreign literature in the field occupy a special place. Since 25 of the 60 standing contributors are non-German, the *Jahrbuch* has become a comprehensive international publication.

In a later review we shall discuss the liturgical contributions to the *Jahrbuch*. Of the hymnological studies the following are of particular importance: "Die beiden bedeutendsten deutschschweizerischen Kirchengesangbücher des 17. Jahrhunderts" (Vol. I, 1955, the Gonzenbach hymnal of 1659 and the Basel hymnal of 1658) by Markus Jenny; "Das Liedbüchlein des Daniel Rump, Ülzen

1587" (Vol. I, 1955) by Konrad Ameln and Ernst Sommer; "Die Weisen des Gesangbuches der Böhmisches Brüder von 1531" (Vol. III, 1957) by Camillo Schoenbaum; "Das Kantional des Georg Weber aus Weissenfels, Erfurt 1588" (Vol. III, 1957) by Ludwig Finscher. It is impossible to mention here the many, many smaller reports and articles offering important material on specific problems. For the same reason we can only call attention to the valuable reports on hymnological research in foreign countries.

The extent to which the *Jahrbuch* has brought together hymnologists from all over the world and has won an assured place for itself may perhaps be demonstrated by the fact that on September 8-11 of this year an international hymnological congress will be held in Lüdenscheid in Westphalia under the leadership of Dr. Konrad Ameln. The congress has set itself the task of coordinating research in the various countries and Protestant churches and of bringing scholars into closer contact.

KARL FERDINAND MÜLLER

## God and Caesar

THE STRUCTURE OF CHRISTIAN ETHICS. By Joseph Sittler. Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 1958. 90 pp., \$2.50.

GOD AND CAESAR: A CHRISTIAN APPROACH TO SOCIAL ETHICS. Essays by Walter E. Bauer and others, edited by Warren A. Quanbeck. Minneapolis: Augsburg Publishing House, 1959. 207 pp., \$3.95.

CHRISTIANS AND THE STATE. By John C. Bennett. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1958. xvii and 302 pp., \$4.50.

The problem of motivation is always discussed in works on Christian ethics, but few such works could be described as actually moving. If we were to employ Thomas De Quincey's famous distinction between the "literature of knowledge" and the "literature of power," most treatises on ethics would have to be included in the former category. They serve to inform, rather than persuade.

The writing of the American Lutheran theologian Joseph Sittler is an exception to



this generalization. Here is a man whose rhetoric is equal to his logic. Perhaps this is a reflection of the fifteen years' experience in communication from the pulpit that preceded his assumption of an academic chair. Prof. Sittler has a truly enviable ability so to marshal English words as to win the reader's heart and to impregnate his imagination, as well as to instruct his mind.

In the first chapter of the present volume, *The Structure of Christian Ethics*, Sittler dwells upon what is undoubtedly one clue to his own literary talents, namely, his continuing attention to great literature, especially poetry and fiction. His own understanding of Christian ethics, he confesses, would be impoverished without the contribution of writers from Boccaccio to G. B. Shaw, as well as before and after, who have helped him to understand the full earthliness of the earthen vessels into which, in each generation, the gospel treasure must be poured. Poets, novelists and dramatists are serving thus as preachers of the law; they explicate the inner character of "nomological existence," to use Werner Elert's phrase.

The reader will be disappointed to discover that the major portion of the present volume (more than 50 of its 90 pages) is reprinted almost verbatim from Sittler's essay in the symposium *Christian Social Responsibility*, edited by Harold C. Letts and published by Muhlenberg Press in 1957. The present version will no doubt serve to bring Sittler's thinking to the attention of a wider public; that this was his own expectation is indicated by his substitution of the terms "Christian" or "Protestant" for "Lutheran." One might reflect here upon the parochialism of the Lutheran press in America, which allowed the Sittler essay as well as the whole 1957 symposium to fall into an obscurity from which the former now is rescued by a state university.

The fundamental position set forth by Sittler is similar in many respects to that of Dietrich Bonhoeffer, combining as it does a fervent appreciation for the created world with the insistence that "Christian ethics is Christological ethics." Sittler finds no contradiction in asserting that Christian ethics must at the same time be radically theocentric, and radically christocentric. The Christian life is understood as the "re-enactment from below on the part of men of the shape of the revelatory drama of God's holy will in Jesus Christ." It is a new and profounder *imitatio Christi*, which is rooted first in Phil. 2:5-11,

only then turning to Matthew 5. Incarnation-crucifixion-resurrection constitutes the "shape of grace," and thus the shape of man's response. "Faith" is the key word, faith expressed both in the spontaneous works of love and in the continuing quest for justice.

Sittler has little use for the philosophical tradition, or, if we may take his statements at face value, for traditional theology. He deplors the "transposition of the organic vitality of biblical speech into the abstract, intellectualized and propositional form of Western theology." It is noteworthy, however, that he has added to his 1957 manuscript a favorable reference to Irenaeus (page 39). Sittler calls for a functional rather than an ontological approach, for a return to a servant-christology rather than a logos-christology.

The concerns of Otto Piper in his contributions to the symposium *God and Caesar* are in many respects similar to those of Sittler. The ethical dynamic of Protestantism was lost, Piper maintains in his essay "Justification and Christian Ethics," when justification became a secondary topic in the *ordo salutis* rather than the basic orientation of the Christian's whole existence. Justification is more than a once-for-all event; it is a life-long process. It means that at every moment I receive the meaning and the validation of my life from God. But this means that I submit myself to God's order, to his intention for the world. By his grace, the curse of self-destructiveness that dogs all merely human action is removed, and a new "kingdom" is built up from which there radiates a host of socially-constructive influences.

Piper criticizes those writers on Christian ethics who "leave one with the impression that its advocates do not believe in the existence of heavenly realities, and that they would probably recommend the same course of action if it could be demonstrated that God did not exist." He urges that we take most seriously the promise of the gifts of the Holy Spirit. In this connection, Piper criticizes the work of Reinhold Niebuhr as having had a predominantly negative effect. The negation of faith is born out of an affirmation, Piper reminds us, and "its effectiveness will depend on the strength of the affirmation rather than on the intensity of one's feeling of dissatisfaction and self-contempt or the stringency of one's self-censures."



Piper is the central figure in this symposium, as he has been in the meetings of the Lutheran Seminar on Social Ethics from which it emerged. Although a professor at Princeton Theological Seminary and identified in the United States with the Presbyterian church, Piper has served as the moderator of the seminar since it was inaugurated thirteen years ago. Sponsored by Valparaiso University, an institution of the Lutheran Church—Missouri Synod, this seminar has brought together for an annual consultation some thirty outstanding scholars representing all branches of Lutheranism in America, who share a theoretical and practical concern for Christian social ethics. As the first visible fruit of the seminar's work, *God and Caesar* will no doubt surprise many who have minimized the social consciousness and/or the scholarly competence of American Lutheranism, for the essays evidence both a maturity of critical judgment and a precision of factual investigation. At the same time, one must acknowledge that the promise implicit in the sub-title is not fulfilled: the volume represents not so much "a Christian approach to social ethics," as a series of approaches to a series of discrete topics. If there is in fact a unanimity of presuppositions and of method attributable to the fact that most or all of the writers are Lutherans, the book itself does not make this unanimity explicit. It would have benefited greatly from an effort more fully to correlate the essays, as well as to arrange them in a more logical sequence.

A number of the contributions are primarily historical in nature. Arthur Piepkorn, professor of systematic theology at Concordia Theological Seminary in St. Louis, in his long essay "Church, Nation, and Nationalism," traces the problem from its origins in the thirteenth century to the present day, showing himself a master of the vast literature that has grown up about the subject. Nationalism in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, Piepkorn suggests, had a special connection with Reformed Protestantism rather than Lutheranism, reaching its first full manifestation in the Puritan Revolution in England. The nineteenth and twentieth centuries are the age of nationalism as a religion, not least in the United States ("manifest destiny," McCarthyism). Its emphasis on the particular and the provincial, Piepkorn sees as a revolt against the universalism implicit in the "Hellenistic-Judaeo-Christian tradition." He admits, however, that in some instances

nationalism represents a justifiable reaction against oppression and misuse.

Jaroslav J. Pelikan, also a Missouri Synod Lutheran but a professor at the Federated Theological Faculty of the University of Chicago, in his essay "Totalitarianism and Democracy: A Religious Analysis," deals in a surprisingly evenhanded way with these two phenomena. Finding modern democracy to be rooted in the philosophy of the Enlightenment, he explicates the viewpoint of the latter on the nature of man and history, moral authority, law and the state, finding it, of course, at many points superficial in comparison with the Christian view. Totalitarianism, Pelikan feels, has taken more seriously man's basically egocentric nature, as well as the corporate character of human existence. Its stress on the need for an external moral authority he finds comparable to the Christian stress on man's dependence upon God. Thus Christian "theonomy" is equally close to and equally distant from democracy's "autonomy" and totalitarianism's "heteronomy." The symmetry of Pelikan's analysis is impressive; but one may question very seriously whether it is adequate to the nature of democracy either in its historical origins or in its present manifestations. There is in Anglo-American democracy at least, a powerful strain of moral realism as well as idealism, of community responsibility as well as individualism; and as such scholars as A. D. Lindsay and James H. Nichols have demonstrated, modern democracy owes as much (or more) to Puritan Protestant Christianity as it does to the Enlightenment.

George W. Forell, newly-appointed professor of systematic theology at Chicago Lutheran Theological Seminary, contributes a substantial essay on "The State as Order of Creation," in which he points out that the New Testament speaks not of *polis* but of *exousia*. Although authority of some kind is integral to human social life, "the modern state in whatever form it may appear is never 'order of creation' in the particular manner in which it happens to organize the community." Reviewing recent Lutheran thought upon the subject, Forell criticizes the "conservative-romantic" notion of the state that he finds rooted in F. J. Stahl, represented also by Adolph Stocker, and expressed later in the writings of Gogarten, Althaus, Hirsch and Wünsch. Forell's own approach to the concrete questions of political order is by means of the concept of a "divine natural



law"; the content of such a law, however, he does not specify in this essay beyond identifying it with "civil justice" or the "Golden Rule."

Otto Piper, in another essay entitled "The Church and Political Form," explores some of the theological reasons for the differing approaches to political ethics characteristic of Lutheranism, Calvinism, and Roman Catholicism. For Lutheranism, he suggests, *vocation* has been the key concept, denoting a man's calling in a specific place and time; whereas the key for Calvinism is the concept of *election*, interpreted in terms of universal and unalterable law. Calvinist ethics therefore has been more abstract, Lutheran ethics more personal. Within Lutheranism, however, Piper sees a divergence between the "heroic" approach of Luther himself, who relied on vigorous action by those specially gifted for public leadership, and the more rational ethics of Melancthon, which finds its exemplification in the conscientious but overly meticulous civil servant. What we need, states Piper, is a new synthesis between these two approaches.

Space is lacking for a detailed review of the other contributions to the volume, which include substantial essays by Walter E. Bauer on "The Philosophy of the American Revolution," by Ernest G. Schwiebert on "The Reformation and the Capitalistic Revolution," and by Paul M. Bretscher on "The Communist Manifesto."

In the case of John C. Bennett's *Christians and the State*, we have a book whose rhetoric, in contrast to that of the first volume here reviewed, unfortunately is not the equal of its logic. Perhaps this is only proper, however, in view of the nature of Bennett's contribution to the theological scene, which has never been that of asserting a bold new position, but rather that of summing up the state of the discussion at any given time. The changing course of the theology of mainstream American Protestantism since the 1930's (from liberalism to a new interest in biblical and Reformation theology), as well as of its social ethics, can be traced in the half-dozen volumes from John Bennett's pen. Of these, *Christians and the State* is both the latest and the longest.

The special focus of Bennett's concern in this volume is the question of the role of Christian social ethics in the context of American religious pluralism. Although he engages in the usual criticism of the Lutheran two-kingdoms doctrine, Bennett

himself closely approximates it when he warns against imposing explicitly Christian standards on a secular or pluralistic culture. "It is wrong," states Bennett, "to seek to make the ethos of one part of the community the basis of law." In a discussion of the idea of natural law (pp. 96 ff.), Bennett provides a valuable summary of the debate on this topic within American jurisprudence. Valuable also is his analysis of the grounds on which Christians should support full guarantees of civil liberties (need for freedom to preach the gospel; Christian love that accepts the right of others to differ; recognition of the limits of one's own knowledge of the truth; skepticism concerning the qualifications of those who wish to serve as censors).

In a chapter entitled "A Protestant View of American Roman Catholic Power," Bennett cautions against allowing past fears and resentments, however justified, to be projected indefinitely into the future. To be sure, the traditional Roman Catholic position calls for a confessionally monolithic state; but there is also in American Roman Catholicism, as Bennett points out, a strong trend of thought that has been working for a rapprochement with religious pluralism and with liberal democracy. Bennett states in some detail his own position on the question of public aid to parochial schools that is still an unresolved issue in American politics. His book will prove useful to those in other countries who wish to inform themselves on the current status of this and other major social-ethical problems in the United States.

FRANKLIN SHERMAN

## What is Christianity?

WAS IST CHRISTENTUM? By Friedrich Gogarten. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck and Ruprecht, 1956. 89 pp., paper, DM 2.40.

DAS LEBEN KANN NOCH EINMAL BEGINNEN. Ein Gang durch die Bergpredigt. By Helmut Thielicke. Stuttgart: Quell Verlag, 1956. 256 pp., DM 11.80.

GESAMMELTE AUFSÄTZE UND KLEINERE SCHRIFTEN. By Friedrich Brunstäd. Edited by Eugen Gerstenmaier and C. G. Schweitzer. Berlin: Lutherisches Verlagshaus, 1957. 424 pp., DM 18.00.



It is difficult not to be too enthusiastic about the little book by FRIEDRICH GOGARTEN, the 72-year-old professor emeritus of the University of Göttingen. It is incumbent upon every Christian, be he a simple man or a learned professor, to be able to state in a relatively few words, simply and clearly, what he believes Christianity to be. That a German professor should do this without writing several learned tomes preceded by even lengthier prolegomena is the sure sign that all the vast scholarship so necessary to intellectual integrity really aims only at laying bare what the gospel itself is, a gospel that can be preached for the salvation of men. Without the scholarship, the gospel is sure to be perverted. Those who fear that those who are carrying on a certain kind of demythologization have no gospel to preach had better take a second look, and do so honestly and without preconceived notions.

Dr. Gogarten's argument is clear and simple. There have been attempts in the past to get at the essence (*das Wesen*) of Christianity either by culling out the timeless truths and so disregarding the "historical" entirely, or else by simply showing what idea takes shape historically in the Christian religion. Neither of these ways can do justice to the "historical" (*geschichtlich*) nature of Christianity.

The crucial term here is the German word "*geschichtlich*," which we translate as "historical," indicating by the quotation marks the peculiar use. Accordingly the realm of "history" is the realm of responsible decision where man shapes the course of history by his decisions. Anyone, therefore, who believes this world to be some kind of a determined process, denying to man the freedom of responsible decision before God or who denies the "reality" of this world and sees the "real" world only as transcendent, will be quite unable to understand the Christian claim.

In Christianity what actually happened in history in the historical person of Jesus is absolutely crucial. Jesus was not a kind of "super-being" but a genuine, true man, according to the unanimous witness of the New Testament and of the church through the years, even though he is also confessed as true God. Hence what happened in him did not happen in a "supranaturalistic" way or as a "super-history," as though the "events" were simply a sort of arbitrary reaching down of what is "above" nature into the "natural," pushing the natural around in a "miraculous"

way. Or, as though what actually took place when Jesus walked the earth and died on the cross was a transaction up in heaven in some transcendent, non-"historical" realm. No! What happened happened on the plane of "history," where man's decisions make a difference. It was on this plane that man fell into sin and so was estranged from God and put under the curse of the law. In this fall he lost his true or authentic being because he did not recognize himself as the creature of God, as the son and heir, who lives at all times only out of the love, grace, and mercy of God, and whose task it is to steward properly the world as God's creation and not to worship it and to confuse it with the Creator. The true man lives out of God and not out of himself and the world which is at his disposal.

This true man actually lived, in Jesus. True, this happened according to God's eternal purpose and there was a whole series of events that led up to it in history. Only in faith are these discerned as God's doing, but they happened in history and made a difference in history. Above all, the sub-Christian notion of a distinction between the profane and the holy, where God acts *ex opere operato* at holy places and in holy objects is not to "spook" around in the kind of world that Jesus' coming revealed the world to be. God does not act upon man as an object but only person to person in an encounter that calls for decision.

Without going into the details of how Jesus by living in the right God-relation, even though tempted like other men, and nevertheless voluntarily becoming a curse for man (Gal. 3:13), effected the reconciliation between God and the world (2 Cor. 5:19), this is the important thing: with Jesus the "new age" actually began in history. Not only Jesus himself was the true man but also all who henceforth are "in Christ" are "new creatures" and "all things are become new" (2 Cor. 5:17).

Gogarten develops at length the analogy of the son and heir (Gal. 4:1-5) who comes of age and really enters into his inheritance and so is himself free from the curse of the law. He lives as God's creature, as the Son, for whom God prepared the inheritance, i.e. the creation. In this creation God himself is present and this creation itself is to be properly stewarded as God's creation. For this a man must be born again, he must become the new creature in Christ and live in faith and not by works. Only then can he do proper works in faith.



There is thus a genuine eschatological crisis (*eschatologische Wende*), which took place in the sphere of history, and made a real difference. This is the important consideration for men today. Men have increased their control over their destiny while at the same time they have opened up the possibility of complete annihilation. This puts a premium upon observance of the law, i.e. upon morality, and so man falls under the curse of the law and does the evil that he would not (Romans 7:13 ff.). Autonomous man is today, despite his morality, yes, because of his morality, destroying himself and his world. Therefore, man's salvation, his actual salvation in history, whereby he will be able to live as a son come of age, lies only in Christ. Precisely because the sphere of man's manipulable world is so increased he puts his trust in his own works and so loses his life in seeking to gain it. The publican went to his house justified (Luke 18:9), i.e. he went to his task and did it in all humility, recognizing that he lived at all times only by God's grace. So he found his true self and so he could properly steward God's creation. The one who thus lives by faith has no illusions about this ever being anything other than the time of decision in which he must always live by faith. He lives therefore both in the hope of a fulfilled creation that lies at the end of time and in a present realization of his full sonship and the freedom of it. This is the gospel to be preached to men today.

This by no means does justice to the clarity and force of Gogarten's argument, but perhaps it will serve as an incentive to give him a hearing. It is to be hoped that this book will be translated into English for it has much to say to Americans particularly who put their trust in their morality and their powers of organization and so are destroying themselves and their world.

HELMUT THIELICKE's book is the third edition of a series of fourteen sermons on the Sermon on the Mount delivered during the bitter war years. They show this great theologian-preacher at his best, his deep penetration into the meaning of the word of God, his searching understanding of the human situation, his forceful, colloquial, yet artistic mastery of language in applying the gospel to the individual in his need.

In the introduction he shows how it is man's great search in this and any day to be freed from his past and open to the future. Therefore, he needs not just good advice, but a Savior. It is this Savior who confronts him

in the Sermon on the Mount. Hence the beatitudes upon all who have come into the decisive relation to God through Jesus Christ. So in every sermon it is made clear that it is Jesus himself that makes the difference. They are the salt of the earth and the light of the world who are really under the lordship of this Christ. The presence of just a few such in the world will make a tremendous difference.

All the familiar words of the Sermon on the Mount then take on new depths of meaning. First of all it is made clear what a devastating preaching of the law Jesus' interpretation of it and his actual living of it is. By no stretch of the imagination can these paradigms of love be considered a new set of moral principles according to which men are now to live with a new feeling of self-righteousness. This preaching of the law leads to the sense of sin from which Jesus alone can rescue. To love the enemy, to give alms without hypocrisy, to pray in complete trust, to discipline oneself purely for the sake of God's kingdom, to live without anxiety in complete trust in the heavenly Father whose arm is never shortened and whose love never fails, to refrain from judging because we see ourselves under judgment and thus see all men with different eyes, to knock at the right door and not just to barge in to the holy of holies—all this is what is demanded. It is, therefore, only through the strictest kind of isolation as an individual that one enters into the kingdom. The only life that can stand in the storm and in the fires of the judgment is one that is grounded firmly in God's word, not only heard but acted upon.

It is hoped that these sermons will be offered in an English translation. Americans especially need to be shocked out of their complacency by preaching that was addressed to people who, humanly speaking, had lost everything and who could no longer be solaced with pious phrases. In the midst of material plenty we need to learn what our real predicament in existence is, how false the idols in whom we put our trust, how exacting the demands of God upon us and how great the redemption won for us.

MARTIN J. HEINECKEN

If in the untimely death of Werner Elert Lutheran theology in its wrestlings with the intellectual and spiritual currents of our time lost an important systematician and historian,



in the death of FRIEDRICH BRUNSTÄD it lost a philosopher and theologian of equal stature. After 30 years as professor of systematic theology in Rostock, he was called home in 1944, at the age of 62. Thus he was unable to make his influence felt in the task of reconstruction after the war and in the dialogue with the prevailing streams in theology associated with the names of Barth and Bultmann. That Brunstäd would have had something to say here is attested by the essays in the present volume on "The Reformation and Idealism" (pp. 77-97), "General Revelation" (pp. 111-140) and "Law and Gospel" (pp. 181-192). Indeed it is a simple fact that through these little known essays, some previously unpublished (e.g. "Revelation and Saving Event in Bultmann," 1941, pp. 217-230), Brunstäd still speaks—or at least should be allowed to speak—in contemporary theological discussion, as he did back in 1935 with his rather well-known essay "The Church and Church Law" (1935, pp. 251-276). We owe the editors a debt of gratitude for helping to give Brunstäd the hearing he deserves. Contributing to that end are the three previously unpublished pieces ("Christian Realism," "Revelation and Saving Event," "Providence and Miracle"), the 20 previously published articles, the bibliography of Brunstäd's complete writings and the indexes of names and subjects.

The volume is divided into three parts: (1) Philosophical Essays; (2) Theological Essays: (a) Basic Questions, (b) The Church; (3) Essays on the State and Economic and Social Questions. This division corresponds to Brunstäd's life work which until now has been of influence more because of his teaching activity than because of his writings. Brunstäd at first taught philosophy at Erlangen; struggle to come to terms with Kant and Hegel (especially epistemological critique and metaphysics) led him to become—in contrast to various tendencies in neo-Protestantism—a theologian who devoted himself to fundamental problems of the Christian faith. Here one might mention his treatment of the questions of personalism (in "Christian Realism"), of subject-object thinking (see the index), or the relation between "Nature and Grace" (p. 111 ff.). It is true that Brunstäd couples "the profound theology of the Reformation with the tendency, imbibed from Idealism, to penetrate fully the life and thought of the world" (Paul Althaus, *Theologische Literaturzeitung*, 83, 1958, col. 740). In

certain situations this coupling is not without harmful effects on theology. A theology is always better off, however, if it sees and clarifies properly its relation to the rest of thought and to the life of the world, than if it gropes along in the dark about such things, or fatuously attempts to limit itself "just to theology," nevertheless sully its theological armor with philosophical assertions and, its theologizing uncontrolled, operating with concepts from all quarters. Only when one has clarified the presuppositions of theology does one come to the problems of theology. Brunstäd defines theology as "knowledge of revelation" (p. 102), *logos* about *theos*—"valid, doctrinal statements about God, in agreement with human knowledge," and likewise about us, "creatures limited and circumscribed, who take on our unclean lips the name of God, who, if he is Reality, is unapproachable, unattainable and unfathomable to the finite." But to perceive, and with the help of Kant's epistemological critique to learn to perceive, what it is that thus determines our thinking and how it is "governed by the idea of the thing in itself" (p. 104), is, after the question of revelation, one of the fundamental questions of theology. Perhaps Brunstäd is therefore in a position to make more intelligible to the Lutheran church Bultmann's important (albeit inadequate) contribution to our understanding of revelation. Insofar as demythologizing is merely resurgent liberalism we must vigorously oppose it, says Brunstäd; but where Bultmann has drawn attention to the "anthropomorphic" nature of myth, and where such reflection leads to reflection on a "doctrine of the meaning of Scripture," there "positive tasks" await us. In criticism of Bultmann he writes: "There are mythical elements in the Bible, but the Bible itself is not mythical.... The language of the New Testament is the language not of myth but of revelation, of the *logos*. Where mythical elements are included in the New Testament, they are changed, demythologized by the very fact that they are used" (p. 225). Naturally this requires closer scrutiny, but in his basic attitude toward the question of Scripture and in his referring us to the goal of preserving, in a doctrine of the authority and meaning of Scripture, "the truth of the doctrine of verbal inspiration" (p. 225), Brunstäd has presented us with a task to be carried out.

We have here given preference to Brunstäd's solutions of fundamental questions. The



other sections of the book are no less important; on social ethics, the nature of the church, the relation between state and church, the nature of law (e.g. "Truth and Law as Divine Ordinance," p. 193 ff.), property and its regulation, and so forth. These essays make clear that Brunstäd was anything but a mere theoretician, a fact attested also by his work as rector of Rostock University and his other administrative duties (from 1922 to 1934 he was director of the Evangelical Social School in Berlin-Spandau and from 1925 on president of the German church's Social Federation). The essay "Higher Education and Social Questions" contains a doctrine of culture, its crises and its renewal. Here belong also other essays, still relevant today, such as "The Spirit and Meaning of an Age of Technology" (1930) and "Does Economic Life have its own Laws?" (1925). The latter is a spirited defense against accusations that would distort trust in God and make of it a cultural optimism with a naive belief in evolution. Trust in God, says Brunstäd, transcends optimism and pessimism; it holds fast to God in faith, despite criticism and despite all.

HORST BEINTKER

## One World, One Gospel

ONE BODY, ONE GOSPEL, ONE WORLD. *The Christian Mission Today.* By Lesslie Newbigin. London and New York: International Missionary Council, 1958. 56 pp.

JESUS' PROMISE TO THE NATIONS. (*The Franz Delitzsch Lectures for 1953. Studies in Biblical Theology, 24.*) By Joachim Jeremias. London: SCM Press, 1958. 84 pp., 7s. 6d. (English edition of JESU VERHEISSUNG FÜR DIE VÖLKER. Stuttgart: Kohlhammer. 80 pp., DM 7.80.)

DIE HEIDENBEKEHRUNG BEI AMBROSIIUS VON MAILAND. (*Supplement VII to Neue Zeitschrift für Missionswissenschaft.*) By Jean Mesot, SMB. Schöneck/Beckenried (Switzerland), 1958. 153 pp.

The widespread interest which BISHOP NEWBIGIN's booklet has aroused, particularly in circles somewhat critical of the impending merger of the International Missionary Council and the World Council of Churches, is quite natural.

In the first place, the author is the newly elected general secretary of the International Missionary Council. And although he explicitly states that the views expressed are not to be regarded as the official views of the organization, this does not sound too convincing, especially after he has explained how the paper came into being. The substance of the present publication was first given informally to a meeting of IMC officers in Montreal in June, 1958. Later it was expanded into a longer paper which formed the basis for a three-day discussion by IMC staff and consultants in September of the same year. In the light of these deliberations, the material was rewritten and then published. One may perhaps safely take for granted that after such a prolonged "processing," the paper, while not enjoying official status, probably does embody much of what was a consensus in these discussions. And even if we accept the statement that the views expressed are the personal views of Bishop Newbigin, it stands to reason that nobody is more likely to bring personal convictions to bear on policy matters in his organization than is a general secretary. This may be particularly true in a new organization and in a situation where policy matters have not been clearly defined.

Secondly, the booklet sets forth some bold ideas, in rather unmistakable language. I imagine that both those who share the convictions of the author on these issues, and those opposed, thank God for the booklet, although for precisely opposite reasons. I am here referring to the following points:

- (1) The fact that Bishop Newbigin visualizes a world-wide, organizationally united church, a church locally and universally united in the visible bonds of word, sacrament, ministry and congregational fellowship (pp. 55-56).
  - (2) His suggestion of some kind of ecumenical missionary order (p. 49).
- (1) There is no doubt in my mind but that Newbigin here has produced a booklet which will make a number of people more hesitant than ever not only about the IMC/WCC merger, but also about the ecumenical movement in general. For here we have a high ranking IMC officer expressing himself in unmistakably clear terms that, here and now, he is for "such visible churchly unity" (p. 56), i.e. as paraphrased under point (1) above.



Unless I have misunderstood what other prominent ecumenical leaders have been saying on this subject for the past several years,\* Newbigin's statement is not good ecumenical Latin. The World Council of Churches is now, and intends to remain, a council of churches, and not a world church. Those of us who feel that there is a real danger of the World Council's developing into just that, now have new evidence put into our hands.

Newbigin's position here is of course not new. Much the same views are found already in *The Household of God* (London: SCM Press, 1953, pp. 19-24). But as the general secretary of the IMC he now speaks from a higher pulpit, and his words will be more carefully recorded.

In all fairness it must be repeated that Bishop Newbigin emphasizes that he does not speak for his organization, and therefore certainly neither for the World Council. Even so, it would help to allay fears if either the author himself, or if not he then some other ecumenical leader, would care to disavow the all too evident implications of the booklet's concluding paragraph concerning church unity (the paragraph preceeding VI. *In Conclusion*, which is a brief summary of the contents of the paper).

(2) The vision of a future ecumenical missionary order is also an explosive issue! Admitting, as does Newbigin, that this is natural logic to one who thinks in terms of a future world church, the implications of the idea are frightening to most of the rest of us, administratively and otherwise. That the Roman Catholic Church already operates more or less along this line does not make the idea more attractive.

Basically the idea of such an ecumenical missionary order ignores confessional and historical developments and ties which seem indispensable and sound in the missionary movement of the church.

The thesis of the booklet is "the whole Church, with one Gospel of reconciliation for the whole world" (p. 12). Newbigin is not offering this as a slogan, and I believe wisely so. Our generation is by now rather weary of all the "wholes" of which we have repeatedly been reminded (the whole gospel, the whole man, etc.).

---

\* The 1950 Toronto statement is at least *in intention* neutral on the question of the form of the church's unity.

Not many will challenge his analysis of the present situation of the Christian missionary movement on the organized, international level. He characterizes it as being in a state of hesitancy, and says that a certain loss of momentum has occurred.

It is when he goes on to analyse the reasons for this phenomenon that he moves toward thin ice: "I do not think that it is in this area of the theology of mission that the main grounds for our present hesitancy lie" (p. 9).

This statement will invite comments. Personally I believe that one of the main reasons why the Christian world mission has lost direction and momentum must be sought in the influence of liberal theology. This is part of the price the missionary movement has had to pay for its flirtation with the social gospel emphasis. In many cases the direct evangelistic thrust has been derailed. We have been led to believe that man must be known through the society in which he lives. Never quite catching up, as far as research and knowledge goes, with the changing society, one might today speak of "the unknown man in mission." Add to this the fact that a tendency to overemphasize organizational structures has made the missionary in some circles "the forgotten man in mission," and one begins to grasp the truth of Newbigin's statement on page 10:

The sense of direction, the feeling of urgency, and the depth of conviction which underlay the slogan "The Evangelization of the World in this Generation" are not present today in anything like the same measure in most of the bodies represented in the IMC and the WCC.

Few would take exception to the truth of this statement. But there is another side to the picture, which also should be kept in mind. Allow me to make a contrasting statement:

The sense of direction, the feeling of urgency, and the depth of conviction which underlay the slogan "The Evangelization of the World in this Generation" are to a large degree present today in many of the missionary organizations operating outside the IMC and the WCC.

Not many missionary leaders would challenge this statement either. And if they did, they would face some heavy opposition from plainspeaking mission statistics. While it is true that some of the more ecumenical-minded churches show a decrease in missionary fervor, some of the so-called "non-cooperating groups" have over the past thirty years exhibited an almost fabulous increase in the number of foreign missionaries.



None of us are blind to the fact that not all missionary activities are theologically motivated. But one would seem on safe ground in saying that the marked difference in missionary fervor in these contrasting groups characterized above has its main roots exactly in the theology of mission. Which again in most cases boils down to a difference of attitude to God's revelation in the Bible.

There are churches today, which, because the impetus and outreach of evangelism have been lost, are now mainly engaged in advocating unity. When a secondary motive replaces a primary one, there is always a loss of direction and of momentum.

Which leads to another main point in Bishop Newbigin's presentation, namely that the gospel of reconciliation cannot be preached (effectively) by a divided church:

How can we, unreconciled to one another, proclaim one reconciliation for the world? How can we be heralds of the one Lord, calling all men to accept His Lordship, when we cannot ourselves live together under His one rule? (p. 54)

Does the fact that the churches are organizationally disunited mean that we "are unreconciled to one another"? Is there but one authorized exegesis of John 17:11?

Taken at face value, the above quotation by Newbigin passes a rather harsh judgment on the total missionary movement, and particularly on the increased efforts of the so-called "non-cooperating groups." And has not history demonstrated "from the time of Cyril and Methodius" (to quote Max Warren at Ghana) that mission and unity are not so siamesically joined together as we now are told?

Several reviewers have commented on how disappointing it is to note how little the author has to say about the problem of *truth*, and the practical implications this has for this matter of unity. Now, he does say that we cannot face this question of unity "without going deep into the issues of faith and order that divide us" (p. 55). But in the same paragraph he puts a directional yoke on the theologians who would undertake such a search for truth, a yoke which I cannot imagine any theologian with personal integrity and professional respect for his source material would accept:

Such seeking will involve the very best insight that our theologians can bring to bear upon the issue; but it will be no merely academic

study, but a study conducted under a deep sense of the obligation to end the scandal of division (p. 55).

Christian mission today is in a state of hesitancy. Newbigin's booklet gives ample documentation of this fact. While there will be general agreement on the diagnosis of this sad phenomenon, the lines of strategy drawn up in the paper will meet both hopeful consent and solid disapproval. Fortunately for all concerned, the kingdom of God is likely to develop, as it indeed has until now, according to its inner nature, and less according to the blueprints of the strategists. In the meantime we are grateful to Bishop Newbigin for stating his views clearly and without hesitation.

SIGURD ASKE

In recent years there have been a number of books on the theology of missions, including Gustav Kvist's *Intet annat Namn* (Helsinki, 1957) and Georg Vicedom's *Missio Dei* (Munich, 1958). JOACHIM JEREMIAS' book differs from these in being purely an exegetical study. It raises the question of the relation of Jesus Christ as a Jew toward other peoples: Was it Jesus' intention to bring his message to non-Jewish people? In the first main part of the book the author stresses that the time of Jesus Christ was a missionary period such as was never seen in Israel, before or after. But Matt. 23:15, a genuine saying of Jesus according to Jeremias and the only one we have from Jesus regarding this Jewish mission, contains a severe judgment of it: "Woe to you, scribes and Pharisees, hypocrites! for you traverse sea and land to make a single proselyte, and when he becomes a proselyte, you make him twice as much a child of hell as yourselves." Moreover, says Jeremias, Jesus told his disciples not to go to non-Jewish peoples: "These twelve Jesus sent out, charging them, 'Go nowhere among the Gentiles'" (Matt. 10:5). He points out further that Jesus limited his own work to the people of Israel. In a few cases he is asked to help non-Jews such as the Syrophenician woman (Mk. 7:24-30) and the centurion (Matt. 8:5-17), but he does not help them until he has pointed out the difference between the Israelitic people and others; they are exceptions, in other words. Mark 14:9, which is generally translated "wherever the gospel is preached in the whole world," should, according to the author, be interpreted



quite differently. It is an eschatological saying, meaning: Truly, I say to you, when (the angels of God) preach the message of victory all over the world then it will also be told (before God) what she has done, so that (at the last judgment) he will think (kindly) of her.

In the second part of the book, on the other hand, the author shows there are several important reasons for believing that Jesus was very much interested in the non-Jewish peoples. He stripped Jewish eschatological expectations of their hatred and promised the non-Jewish peoples a share in salvation. It is very clear that the mission of Jesus and Lordship of Jesus comprehend all peoples. It seems, therefore, that there are two different attitudes of Jesus toward the non-Jewish peoples.

The solution is given in the third main part of the book where it becomes clear that Jesus' message for both Jewish and non-Jewish people should be understood eschatologically. As long as Jesus was working here among men his mission was limited to Israel. Jesus read in his Bible about the eschatological journeying of all people to the mountain of God. This journey will take place at the end of time, and here God will appear and call everyone to him. Hither all the heathen will come, and here on the holy mountain all will worship and the wonderful salvation banquet will be spread. This eschatological point of view we must keep in mind, says Jeremias, whenever we try to understand the message of Christ concerning his own mission and its relation to non-Christian people, and the idea of mission in his message.

This view, the author says in his conclusion, means that mission is firmly grounded in the history of salvation. With Easter the consummation has begun, and mission is the dawning of the consummation. In the Christian mission God himself is working. The Christian mission is being eschatologically realized now.

For all mission leaders, missionaries and friends of missions, a thorough study of this excellent book is recommended.

CONRAD RENDTORFF

"Da, Domine, pisces"—"Give fish, Lord"—was the characteristic prayer of Ambrose, bishop of Milan (340-397), as well as the

motto of his life. This missionary attitude accorded with the "great missionary significance attaching to the establishing of a bishop's see" (p. 51). JEAN MESOT's book on the bishop is exciting reading. At the end the reader is grateful to the author for having led him through the source material and for having given him something for his theological kit.

Ambrose was not a missionary in our technical, professional sense of the term. The unusual thing was for him quite usual, namely that in his bishop's office he was a missionary; conversion was one of the chief elements of his pastoral care. He had dealings with four emperors and felt himself responsible for their faith and salvation. His language was blunt ("You are a man," p. 32); he could tell an emperor the truth to his face and, where necessary, threaten excommunication (pp. 44, 42, cf. also 27, 30, 31). His "entire apostolic activity was directed in principle to all men. Whether it was a pagan, Jew or heretic, a man of the upper class or one of the ordinary people, rich or poor, young or old, man or woman, no one was excluded" from his ministry (p. 133). In addition to personal conversations and letters, Ambrose worked through preaching especially. His sermons were not "missionary" sermons in our sense; rather his usual sermon testified to God's will that all should be saved and to the universal validity of Christ's work of salvation (p. 133). In his sermons the little word "all," so important in the Bible and its message of salvation, turns up again and again. Like Christ, Ambrose, his servant, wanted the hearts of all men. He was a persistent and vigorous opponent of the contemporary custom of delaying baptism, for "no one (he says) ascends into the kingdom of heaven except through the sacrament of baptism" (p. 79).

Interesting from the point of view of method is Ambrose's emphasis on the ability to approach people on the strictly human level and his emphasis on the new life to be lived by Christians, the establishing of Christian families and post-baptismal pastoral care of the newly baptized (since Ambrose believed that the most difficult part of conversion came after baptism). Hymns were also important in mission, said Ambrose, who himself wrote many. "Written in a simple meter and accompanied by a simple melody, his hymns sang like a simple song of the people," so that "all who were hardly capable



of being pupils became teachers" (p. 89). In his *Confessions* Augustine writes that these songs and hymns in the church moved him to tears (*Confessions*, IX, 6, 14).

ARNO LEHMANN

## *Eucharist and Sacrifice*

**EUCCHARIST AND SACRIFICE.** By Gustaf Aulén. Translated by Eric H. Wahlstrom. Philadelphia: Muhlenberg Press, 1958. 212 pp., \$3.50.

**HET AVENDMAAL BIJ LUTHER.** By C. J. Munter. Groningen: I. Oppenheim, 1954. 123 pp.

In this translation of an earlier work, the "grand old man" of Swedish ("Lundensian") theology treats one of the most debated problems in present-day ecumenical discussions: Eucharist and sacrifice. Bishop Aulén has been in on these discussions from the very beginning. It is with some anticipation, therefore, that one looks to the guidance of this esteemed teacher of Lutheran theology.

The first part of the book is a description of the ecumenical setting of the problem. The author deals with the reports of recent ecumenical conferences (especially that at Lund in 1952), where the discussions of both intercommunion and ways of worship revolved, for the most part, around the concept of sacrifice. This somewhat lengthy recapitulation of recent documents some may find rather tiring. Although the voices of other contemporary theologians are brought into the conversation, the author's main purpose seems to be to come to "speaking terms" with Anglican theologians, who very often regard ecumenical discussions of the Eucharist as having arrived at a deadlock. Unfortunately the author never raises the question whether the "deadlock" is traceable to the fact that the concept of sacrifice has become the all-embracing problem in discussions of the Eucharist. Instead he seems to accept this as the starting point and aims at a solution which would, in the end, be acceptable to Anglicans.

I can agree with many details of the author's discussion of the problem. Nevertheless, I would feel happier had he examined the *presuppositions* on which the whole framing of this question depends. Personally I am convinced that the "deadlock"—if one accepts that there is such in our ecumenical situation—is traceable to the fact that the concept of sacrifice governed the documents of the Lund conference, just as it still governs many ecumenical documents on the Eucharist today.

Reviewing the position of the Reformation (Luther), Bishop Aulén rightly points out that one can have a positive appreciation of the concept of sacrifice if it is formulated in a way which does not conflict with the unique, once-for-all act of Christ on the cross. He finds that such a concept is a direct consequence of the doctrine of the real presence of Christ, i.e. his sacrifice *for us*. Aulén introduces a distinction between Christ's atoning sacrifice and the sacrifice which is "an expression of the indissoluble union between Christ and his church."

In drawing upon the New Testament evidence he comes to the heart of the matter by searching for the real setting of the Eucharist in the gospel. In his plea for the unity of the crucified and risen Christ, the cross and the resurrection, we recognize the author of *Christus Victor*. He also extends the concept of sacrifice to the whole work of redemption, stressing that Jesus' death as self-oblation is present in his life from the very beginning. But is it correct to speak of a sacrifice which is a continuous offering by the heavenly Christ? Here the author discusses passages from the Epistle to the Hebrews in an effort to show that Christ's heavenly intercession may be regarded as sacrifice. He is aware of the fact, however, that the New Testament never really calls this intercession a "sacrifice." He is nevertheless willing to accept the term, referring to the sacrifice of praise (Heb. 13:15), to the Old Testament and to "current Christian usage." "The intercessory sacrifice," he says, "is not designed to create a new covenant, but to realize the covenant which has already been established." "Furthermore, it may be biblical to speak of a sacrifice of intercession which the High Priest offers continually." Again: "We enclose our prayers in the intercessory prayers of Christ. He receives them and unites them with his mighty intercession."

Bishop Aulén is certainly pointing to



legitimate biblical thoughts. He is also right in saying that these concepts have been forgotten in the "Protestant" tradition, which as a consequence was then justly criticized. We are also ready to acknowledge his definite protest against phrases like "we offer Christ": such expressions "turn the biblical kerygma upside down." But why does he then connect these legitimate concepts with the concept of sacrifice? Does he not thereby make a concession which opens the door to an interpretation which was found already in the ancient church on the threshold of the Middle Ages? I refer to the linking of Christ's intercession with his sacrifice, i.e. looking upon the consecrated elements of the Eucharist as a reason for being heard by God. This is of course not the place to develop how and why this displacement of the original concept of intercession on the one hand and sacrifice on the other came to be fateful for the history of the Eucharist. And Bishop Aulén may answer by saying that "expressions which cannot lead to 'false associations' are very few in number." I am nonetheless convinced that the problem we face here is theological, and not simply terminological. It would be interesting to show how this book by Aulén has paved the way for offering a formula with which Anglicans could agree.

The problem of "Eucharist and sacrifice" will not be solved without the following radical changes in our approach to theological discussions. (1) The *presence* of Christ's redemptive work as a whole in the Eucharist should be discussed without any reference to the concept of sacrifice, which in contemporary discussion as well as in the history of doctrine is heavily misinterpreted and freighted with a number of alien or ambiguous connotations. (2) Discussion should begin with the concept of "offering," as related to the First Article, as a term designating the bringing forth of earthly gifts for the service of people in need; that is to say, discussion should begin in the realm of creation where in both the history of religions and the Eucharist the offering of the products of human endeavor as well as of man's own self has a legitimate place.

Bishop Aulén's book will certainly be read with interest not only by those concerned with ongoing ecumenical discussion of the problem of "Eucharist and sacrifice" (although they may find that few, if any, new arguments have been advanced), but especially by those seeking to know more about these ecumenical

discussions. They will find a good deal of information, presented with the ease and skill of a master.

VILMOS VAJTA

C. J. MUNTER's doctoral dissertation is a significant contribution to the abundance of literature on Luther's theology of Holy Communion.

Munter believes that in his first lectures and especially in his lectures on Hebrews (1517) Luther still holds the medieval view of communion. His thinking is not yet consciously anti-Roman or anti-Enthusiastic. A new element is discernible, however, as the author shows with reference to Luther's exposition of Heb. 9:16 f. God's "covenant" or "will" Luther interprets as the promise of the forgiveness of sins and eternal life, and connects this with Jesus' words in Lk. 22:20 ("This cup which is poured out for you is the new covenant in my blood").

In 1520, says Munter, Luther first became convinced that the traditional celebration of Holy Communion contradicted both the clear statements of the Bible and the practice of the early church. Holy Communion had been subjected to a "Babylonian captivity" which consisted in the failure of the Roman church to distinguish clearly between God as the Giver and the sacrament as his gift.

Three years later when Luther had to define his position over against the Bohemian Brethren, the Enthusiasts and the Zwinglians, he emphasized that Christ's presence in communion is not to be understood in a "spiritual" sense. Munter makes very clear why Luther was so emphatic in emphasizing the "is" against the "signifies" championed by those three groups. The word in Holy Communion is the word of the *Creator*. Here Augustine's dictum *accedat verbum ad elementum et fit sacramentum* was of great significance for Luther. God is the Creator who is present here and now, who in the words of promise gives what they offer. Just as in the "secular" sphere God is present in the various roles [*Ämter*] filled by people, so in Holy Communion he is present as the almighty Creator. When parents give their children food and clothing and the pastor preaches the word of God to his congregation, God is working through creaturely agents in giving life to men. God always works—also in communion—through an external sign which becomes something more than a sign



or symbol when it is transformed into a bearer of the divine gift.

God is always present in the secular as in the spiritual sphere; it requires only faith to recognize him as the gracious God and to offer him praise. *Praesentia realis* means that God's presence is an objective fact not dependent on faith; and yet faith is required. The sun shines upon the blind man but it has no subjective significance for him. Therefore God creates faith, through which we discover God's gifts and render him our thanks.

The author's approach is purely historical and systematic. Only on the periphery does one find a certain amount of polemic. Gustaf Aulén's dualistic conception of atonement is questioned, for example. Following O. Tiilikä, the author accuses Aulén of annulling to some extent Luther's dialectical conception of the relation between law and gospel. In Luther's conception of atonement, says Munter, God in Christ is not (as Aulén thinks) merely subject, the redeemer doing battle with the hostile powers; he is also the object who is reconciled.

DAVID LÖFGREN

## A Barthian Luther

LUTHERS PREDIGT VON GESETZ UND EVANGELIUM. *Forschungen zur Geschichte und Lehre des Protestantismus*, 10. Reihe, Bd. XI. By Gerhard Heintze. Munich: Christian Kaiser, 1958. 291 pp., paper, DM 13.20, cloth, DM 15.80.

A better title for the doctoral dissertation of Gerhard Heintze, former director of studies at the Lutheran seminary connected with the famous Church of St. Michael in Hildesheim, would perhaps be *The Barthian Luther*.

In effect the author attempts to impose on Luther the Barthian gospel-law sequence. In his introduction he does say that his book is intended not merely as a historical study; he would rather that it also stimulate thinking on what it means to *preach* the law and the gospel today. He also seeks to demonstrate, however, that the intentions of the Barthian sequence are, at least on the basis of Luther's preaching, correct.

Heintze has worked through and interpreted Luther's sermons on three major groups of texts: the decalogue, the Sermon on the Mount (together with the twofold law of love) and the passion narrative. He makes the repeated discovery that in an actual sermon Luther's distinction between law and gospel did not play a decisive role, even though Luther characterized these texts (especially the decalogue and the Sermon on the Mount) as pregnant summaries of the law. As far as the method and execution of these sermons are concerned, says Heintze, it was the text and not a theoretical pattern of interpretation that was normative (p. 257).

The real concern behind the use of the law to convict man of sin (*usus elenchthicus legis*) is of course very much in evidence in all three groups of sermons, says Heintze. But he shows that in these sermons sin is not laid bare by the law apart from the gospel; rather it is the gospel in its inmost core which brings recognition of sin. In Luther's exposition of the decalogue this is seen in the way he again and again refers all the individual commandments to the basic promise of the prologue, "I am the Lord your God." In his exposition of the Sermon on the Mount and in sermons on related texts, Luther does not conceal the fact that where the *usus elenchthicus legis* is concerned, it is *disciples* who are being instructed. And in leading his hearers to a recognition of their sins in his sermons on the passion, he does not hesitate to draw upon Christ's suffering, which was actually for man's salvation; indeed Christ's suffering makes clear the depths of man's fall into sin, for which man himself is unable to answer. The positive directions for the Christian life given in Luther's sermons are, according to the author, ultimately evangelical exhortations "enticing and alluring" the believer to stand fast in faith and love. It would therefore be well, says Heintze (p. 258), to speak not of a *tertius usus legis* but (and here he follows Joest's *Gesetz und Freiheit: Das Problem des tertius usus legis bei Luther und die neutestamentliche Parainese*, Göttingen, 1951) of an *usus practicus evangelii*.

This is all very true; it is hardly disputed in modern Luther research any longer. The relation between law and gospel in Luther is really much more complicated than orthodoxy, e.g., or pietism assumed (cf. the dissertation by H. Ivarsson, *Predikans uppgift*, Lund, 1957, which exists only in Swedish but has a summary in German; unfortunately it appeared



too late for the author to take account of it). The author finds his point of view confirmed by the *usus civilis legis*. According to Luther the "evangelical exhortations" [*Anweisungen*] of the New Testament cannot, to be sure, be applied as legal norms directly to the structures of life in the secular sphere. But, says Heintze, on the basis of the revelation of God's love in the gospel, preaching reveals how the law's strict rule in the secular sphere ultimately serves this love which in this way preserves the world externally; thus the law rather than destroying the world because of its sin, creates a place in it for the preaching of the gospel (p. 259). From these findings the author concludes that in the various *usus* of preaching we have not differences in content but different aspects of one and the same gospel. The actual subject of the various *usus* is not man but God's Holy Spirit.

Are these findings in tension with Luther's repeated demand not to overlook the fundamental difference between law and gospel? Heintze tries to show that Luther came to emphasize the difference increasingly as a result of the disturbances connected with the Enthusiasts, the sorry sights seen on his visitation, and his controversy with the antinomians. In the process a completely different conception of the relation between law and gospel begins to emerge in Luther. The preaching of the law, to lead to knowledge of sin and to repentance, is supposed to prepare the way for the comforting preaching of the gospel. God puts to death and raises up to life. Out of death flows life. But now Heintze finds himself in trouble. What becomes of his original thesis? Doesn't Luther here derive the law from the gospel after all? Was Luther then not a Barthian?

Despite these difficulties the author does not believe it necessary to abandon his thesis. He tries to prove that the idea of the law as distinct from the gospel occurs but rarely in Luther's sermons on the passion. Moreover he lays the didactic expositions of the differences between law and gospel in Luther's sermons at the door of Luther's editors, especially the "Melanchthonian" Cruciger. Finally, says Heintze, Luther's personal religious development was so determinative for his preaching that he was not able to leave the law behind as a stage overcome by the gospel.

The author also attempts to show, however, an inner connection between Luther's didactic retention of the enduring dualism of law and gospel and his fundamental understanding

of God's activity, as revealed to Luther in the heart of the gospel. Unfortunately the author was unable to make full and proper use of Luther's statements on this score; instead he uses them to substantiate his Barthian thesis. Since God is always the subject of preaching and since God always "puts to death and brings back to life, leads down to hell and out again," God is the subject not merely of the preaching of law and gospel but also of the proper *distinction* between law and gospel in the Christian's life. Testifying to how God works through the law would then belong necessarily to the task of preaching, says Heintze, sticking to his affirmation that Luther's preaching moves from the gospel to the law. According to Heintze—and contrary to many express statements of Luther—the law is understood only as "evangelical" guidance for living, as a new "form" of the preaching of the gospel, following upon the gospel.

Here we would comment, first—and this should not be forgotten especially in a study of Luther's preaching—that in Luther's theology the relation between law and gospel is not developed solely on the basis of the preached word. The author is aware of this, it seems, but it is never really expressed. The fact that the proclamation of the *gospel* is the main task of preaching does not preclude that prior to preaching, the law of God is a power and a pressing reality for man. In man's vocation and at his work God's law will make demands upon him, even if he is not a believer. Therefore it is impossible to superimpose the Barthian gospel-law sequence, from Luther's preaching, upon his whole theology. True, the author does try to avoid this fallacy by restricting his analysis to Luther's *Predigtweise*, but because this is not unequivocally expressed he is not able to arrive at a correct interpretation of Luther.

The question at issue, it seems to me, is not whether one can find in Luther's preaching his real intentions; the issue is rather whether we can find in Luther's sermons the same fundamental viewpoint that we have in his other writings. From the standpoint of preaching (or of the man under grace), there is in Luther a dialectical, reciprocal relation of law to gospel; from the standpoint of the concept of "doctrine" (or the situation of man under sin), there is a temporal, dualistic relation between law and gospel. "Doctrine" sees man as a continuing sinner who must *first* be put to death by the law and then called



to life by the gospel. In preaching, this fundamental relation between law and gospel changes insofar as man is now released from the power of the law and given, in faith, a new starting point in which the dualistic relation between law and gospel is suspended to be replaced by a dialectical relation. Prior to preaching, the law was the mortal enemy which drove men to the gospel; but now, in faith, man moves from the gospel to the law unafraid, in the certainty that God's gracious intent of saving him is no longer imperiled by the law. From the standpoint of preaching the law is in a certain sense suspended. That man cannot bring this about himself—i.e. the fact that God is the subject—is not the decisive point, however; the decisive thing is that on this earth man always remains a sinner before God and therefore in a certain sense always remains under the law.

Hence the flight from the gospel to the law cannot cease. To be sure something new has come into a person's life when, with his new freedom from the law, he is driven from the gospel to the law. The new element, however, consists not in the deriving of the law from the gospel but in the disclosure, through preaching, that man is moved and preserved by God's sin-destroying will but also by his loving and preserving will. As well as sharpening God's demands, the gospel discloses God's omnipotence which, already prior to the gospel, confronts man in the blessings of creation (which are different from the gospel). Preaching therefore leads away from the law; but, more than that, man is helped to a positive relation to the law, a relation in which he is reborn. Thus begins discipleship, in which we are called upon to bear our cross, which we do, according to Luther, not in isolation from people who stand under the law but in a solidarity of service. Discipleship is love for one's neighbor, love that is realized only when we who find ourselves freed from the law allow ourselves to be placed under the law. We thus return to the image of God in which we were created and which in Christ became reality.

Thus the law continues to place demands upon the believer too, but the law is not the same thing as the gospel. Since according to Luther man does not yet live in the *lumen gloriae*, and "doctrine" must therefore be a *theologia crucis* and not a *theologia gloriae*, the didactic and comprehensive relation between law and gospel that is valid for this life is the chronological one.

The way to life leads through death. Preaching discloses that in this process God always remains the subject, and that it is confrontation with the gospel which deepens man's knowledge of sin. This does not alter the fact, decisive for Luther's understanding of the relation between law and gospel, that God first puts to death and then raises up to life. The gospel retains its gift character only when it is preached unequivocally, as the good news of the forgiveness of sins and the promise of eternal life and is kept free of all demands and requirements of the law. Only thus does Luther succeed in maintaining a dialectical relation and a dualistic antithesis between the gospel (the unconditioned gift) and the law (the unconditioned demand).

Heintze is able to undergird his position with frequent Luther quotations only because he has not retained the concept of law and gospel as it is found in Luther. To demonstrate that in detail would lead beyond the bounds of this review, however. (The Luther quotations on p. 162 ff. especially can, in my opinion, be differently interpreted.)

The fact that the author approaches Luther with questions framed in a way not particularly suitable to Luther makes his terminology somewhat unsettled. Sometimes it is not clear whether he is talking about the law or legalism. One is inclined to ask, for example, whether he has not perceived that for Luther Christ too has stood under the law and that Christ's passion cannot be interpreted unequivocally as gospel, as an event isolated from the resurrection, just as the resurrection cannot be preached apart from the passion.

In a study on the relation between law and gospel in Luther—even if limited only to his sermons—it seems to me very important to proceed from *Luther's* overall viewpoint and not from that of some other person. Only in this way is it possible rightly to interpret and make use of the concepts of his theology, with its limits and in its breadth. By employing vague terminology the author has succeeded in making a Barthian of Luther. It may be that for our present understanding of Scripture Luther's theology is not always useful, but that should not be the determining factor in a Luther study. The aim should be to reproduce correctly what Luther himself understood by "law" and "gospel."

My criticism has had an edge to it because the subject Heintze treats is of extreme relevance. Admiration for what he has achieved in his study is not thereby excluded.



The book is no mean challenge to contemporary systematics and homiletics. In its method at least, if not always in its content, it can serve as a good introduction to Luther's style of preaching, in addition to offering a systematically—if not historically—conceived contribution to the burning and much discussed problem of law and gospel. It is more

of a personal contribution to the problem of preaching as such, and more of a practical help to anyone who wants to deepen his acquaintance with the task of preaching, than an introduction to *Luther's* understanding of how and why we preach law and gospel.

DAVID LÖFGREN



## CORRESPONDENCE

### Confessions and Churches

Sir:

I read with great interest the symposium "Confessions and Churches" in the March, 1959 issue. Whatever the record in the past, the younger churches will have to stand on a clear confession, it seems to me. I personally do not believe that the whole Book of Concord must constitute their only foundation of faith. African Christians face other enemies than those the fathers of the Reformation had to deal with. It will come to a certain "Confessio Africana."

The answers to the first question about confessions and/or culture are of great importance. Some European missionaries have always been working to preserve indigenous culture and have said we need conquer only paganism. But from my own experience with the paganism of southern Africa it is almost impossible to separate paganism and culture. If you kill paganism, you kill the culture at the same time. The pastor from Southwest Africa is right when he says that the culture is pagan and must yield to Christ. When a real conversion takes place, new forms of culture are formed. Very often when we tried to fill pagan terms with Christian contents, precisely the opposite took place: the people accepted the Christian terms and gave them pagan meanings.

The leaders of the younger churches must take a firm and clear stand; otherwise they will soon be overrun by their pagan environment. . . . Some Christians here seemingly feel that Christian monogamy is an unnecessary burden which is not in conformity with the Bible which says nothing against the polygamy of David or Solomon. So one of the items in the "Confessio Africana" will be polygamy. . . .

H. PFITZINGER

*Johannesburg, South Africa*

### Reply to a Reply

Sir:

After his return from his first visit to Latin America, Dr. Adolf Wischmann put down in the June 1958 issue of *Lutheran World* his impressions of the situation of Protestantism in Latin America and confronted these with

the reports given at the meeting of the Committee on Latin America in Dubuque, Iowa, in 1957.

The churches and congregations in Latin America which are connected with the Evangelical Church in Germany (EKD), and which were the primary objects of this visit of the new director of the EKD's Office of External Affairs, were very grateful that a few weeks after taking office he saw fit to observe at first hand the situation of those churches which grew out of the EKD and are today in a contractual relation with it. His report gives evidence that despite the limited time at his disposal, Dr. Wischmann succeeded in getting a good picture of the real situation of these churches and in seeing their chief problems clearly. These churches were grateful to find that he saw all the many facets of their problems and declined to give pat answers to them.

It is quite possible to disagree with his judgment of this or that question, but one can hardly say that his observations were superficial.

In the March 1959 issue (p. 438 f.) appear some critical remarks on Dr. Wischmann's report. The author of the letter is decidedly in favor of the thesis that Latin America is mission field number one and says "if Evangelical mission work is not necessary in Latin America, then the Reformation of the 16th century was not necessary either." Let us bypass the question whether it is altogether felicitous to speak of Latin America as mission field number one. The words are, at the very least, subject to misinterpretation, for the church's mission field must always be "all the world." That Evangelical missionary work in Latin America is necessary, no one is likely to dispute. The question, however, is whether mission work must necessarily be carried out everywhere and in every age in the same way, namely, by sending out people commissioned as missionaries.

The author of the letter agrees with the criticism expressed at Dubuque of the "folk churches" (by which are meant the churches in Latin America connected with the EKD); they are reproached with "too little mission work and lack of interest in public affairs." He believes this assertion can be proved by pointing out that these churches "have limited their activity almost completely to the German immigrants and their descendants." They



have, he says, "made practically no effort to proclaim the gospel to the millions of Latins who live without it." The German pastors should not be condemned for this, he continues, since "they have had more than enough to do" but "the fact remains that the 'Volkskirche' has not approached the Latins."

When the author speaks of Latins in terms of "millions," that means, necessarily, people who belong to the Roman Catholic Church or have at least been baptized in it. Now it is true that as we see it, instruction is a necessary part of baptism. Yet we must also recognize that that is not necessarily the way Roman Catholics see it; for them trust in the church and its claim to truth suffices for salvation. In any case, doing mission work among baptized Roman Catholics is a deliberate invasion of the sphere of the Roman Catholic Church. Aside from this question of principle (i.e. whether the Lutheran church today has any right to regard the Roman Catholic Church as a pagan sphere), the "folk churches" cannot regard such mission work as their task if it can be carried out only by surrendering the primary responsibility they have inherited from their history. Their pastors were not sent as preachers without a congregation; they went out with a definite commission—to care for Protestant people—and they were always too few to care properly for the people entrusted to their charge. To be honest, the "folk churches" must speak of solidarity in distress with the Roman Catholic Church. The latter would not find it difficult to demonstrate that among the 750,000 Latin American Lutherans there are some which are Lutheran in name only. But that is surely true in other places besides Latin America.

It distorts the picture to say that the "folk churches" "have limited their activity almost completely to the German immigrants and their descendants" and have not addressed themselves to the Latins, and have therefore done too little mission work. At least it should be added that these churches were and still are in the midst of their Latin American environment. The church in the world is, to be sure, no longer the church if it has forgotten its commission to the world. The church of the Reformation was certainly aware of this commission and was in consequence a missionary church, even though it sent out not one missionary to the heathen. It is not the number of missionaries a church sends to the heathen which determines

whether or not it is a missionary church. What is decisive is whether that church knows it is sent to the world, and primarily to the world in which it finds itself. The "folk churches" in Latin America have not yet sent out a single missionary to any continent. They do not believe that is their most pressing task. Their obedience to the Lord's commission they see as consisting in being living churches of the gospel in the place where they are and in preaching the gospel publicly. As far as the church in Brazil is concerned, it knows it is a minority, even though it is the largest Protestant church in Latin America. It does not conceal its existence in Brazil. It does not limit its activity to a certain group of people. It preaches in the language of Brazil and in German—as well as in Hungarian, Lithuanian and Estonian. It has its own bilingual newspapers. It makes much use of the radio. Some of its members are in the mainstream of public life, as politicians, scholars and business men. It has about 300 elementary schools and 22 secondary schools which prepare for entrance to the university. One cannot honestly say that the church in Brazil is an alien body or that it leads an isolated existence. It is true that in its first 100 years its work was, necessarily and in the nature of the case, the job of gathering and conserving. At the same time, today it is a simple fact that the church in Brazil knows it must shoulder some of the responsibility for the whole country and the country's future. For over 100 years the history of the "folk churches" in Latin America has been closely intertwined with the histories of the countries in which they were located. Not only geographically but in the consciousness of their members as well, they are Latin American churches. Take away the three "folk churches" and there remains barely five per cent of the 750,000 people estimated as comprising Latin American Lutheranism, as was pointed out most recently at the conference in Buenos Aires last April.\*

When in his report Dr. Wischmann gives the memberships of the various churches (Chile 25,000, Brazil 650,000, La Plata Synod 100,000), he is quite obviously using round figures (not the latest statistics) to give a picture of the ratio of their respective sizes. He is again employing round figures when he sets the membership of the Iglesia

\* See the report on p. 159. (Editor.)



Unida at 5,000. According to the 1957 statistics, which were not available to Dr. Wischmann when he made his journey at the end of 1957, that figure is too high, as Prof. Deibert pointed out. The actual number of baptized members stands at 3,786. The same statistics show that to care for this number the Iglesia Unida has 24 pastors and ordained missionaries and nine lay workers. If the express purpose of the Iglesia Unida is to bring the gospel to millions of Latins, but the statistics show that after 50 years of work 1,057 of the 2,540 confirmed members are Latins and the others of German or other origin, then it is not all clear what grounds there are for criticizing the "folk churches" and their activity.

On the language question it goes without saying that one can hope for "less foot-dragging"—in moving from German to Spanish or Portuguese, for instance—just as long as it is clear that this is a personal wish, one not binding on churches. The church itself will have to act in accordance with the facts. It will preach in the language which the people to whom it addresses itself understand and through which it can reach their hearts. It will have to remember that command of a certain amount of vocabulary does not yet mean being at home in that language. In a land being settled by immigrants, the church will contend for the right of people to use their mother tongue. In no case will it be interested in effecting a change from one language to another or in accelerating the process of change. The church will, however, always have to do justice to the given situation. That means our churches in Latin America will at first have to use two or more languages. Whether that will be for a longer or shorter period of time can be regarded as an idle question.

Today no one is likely to dispute that the proclamation of the message of the Reformation is possible in any language. We also know that it is difficult to translate that message into the Spanish and Portuguese world of concepts. This translation would best be done by those who are fully at home in both languages, Luther's German and modern Spanish or Portuguese. In the nature of the case, this process will proceed at a slow pace.

In view of the size of the task confronting us here, we are happy—and cannot be thankful enough—that today pastors in Europe and especially in Germany are ready

to serve in our churches for a few years (for periods of 6 or 15 years, as a rule) or all their life. We do not regard this as something to be taken for granted. It is a formidable piece of brotherly service, through which our mother church helps us and for which the pastors volunteer, with no guarantee of a salary that is adjusted to conform to the cost of living index. When one thinks of 95 per cent of the Latin American Lutherans, then one can only be grateful to the German pastors who come to Latin America, some to live there permanently and serve the churches their whole life. In any case one should avoid the unpleasant word "import." To say that Dr. Wischmann thinks that our churches "depend on pastors imported from Europe" instead of considering "the possibility of training pastors here in Latin America" is an unpardonable insinuation. One of the pastors sent out by Dr. Wischmann's office teaches at the seminary in José C. Paz, where Prof. Deibert teaches. At the same seminary there are, as far as I know, students from both the La Plata and Chilean synods. In his report Dr. Wischmann mentions the seminary at Sao Leopoldo; from this school about 40 Brazilian pastors have now graduated. It is not clear therefore why anyone should say that the "folk churches" have been reluctant to make use of this possibility. The seminary in Sao Leopoldo has special reason to thank Dr. Wischmann's office for much help, particularly in obtaining qualified teachers; the seminary is thus preparing Brazilian students for teaching positions. The seminary assumes on the part of its students knowledge of the ancient languages (Greek, Latin and Hebrew) as well as of Portuguese and German, so that the eight semesters can really be devoted solely to the study of theology. It is self-evident that the church should be vitally concerned that its future pastors be able to draw upon Luther's theology from the sources themselves.

When in the second to last paragraph of his letter the author agrees with Dr. Wischmann that "one of the most important demands of the moment is the dissociation of Latin American churches from alien models and ideologies," but then goes on to say that "it will be practically impossible to achieve this end as long as these churches depend on pastors imported from Europe," he is evidently forgetting that it is not only Europe which we have to thank for the sending out



of young pastors. I am, however, unable to think of a theological reason which would make it imperative to inquire about the origin or nationality of a minister of the gospel.

It is a fact we have to come to terms with that the various Lutheran churches in Latin America are, for historical and theological reasons, quite different in structure. "One must see each church as it sees itself," said a visitor from North America not too long ago; "only then can one really understand its true nature and its problems." To make that possible is one of the tasks of the Latin American conferences. The most recent one, in Buenos Aires, showed that we have come a good part of the way toward being ready to give ear to one another and to learn from one another.

ERNESTO SCHLIEPER

Rio de Janeiro

### Schism or Heresy?

In the March issue of *Lutheran World*, Dean Hans Asmussen of Heidelberg commented at length on the ecclesiastical and theological relations of Protestantism to the Roman and Orthodox churches. He complained that while there has been an increase in theological study of the Roman church, almost nothing has been done to establish contact between the Roman and Protestant churches. On the other hand, he says, there has been increasing contact with the Russian Orthodox church while theological work lags far behind.

I do not wish to go into this rather exaggerated criticism of attempts to establish contact with the Orthodox churches. I want, however, to call attention to one small, but not insignificant, error in Asmussen's letter. In speaking of Rome's stand with regard to Orthodoxy, Asmussen says, "Theologically matters seem to be clear: in Rome's eyes the

Moscow church is a schismatic church but the Protestant churches are heretical churches" (p. 443). The same opinion is also expressed by Oliver Tomkins in the *History of the Ecumenical Movement* (London, 1954): "Rome does not regard the Orthodox Churches as being heretical" (p. 678). Is that still true today? It may well have been true in the Middle Ages, but since the Vatican Council there has been a change. If one looks at canon 1325, § 2, of the *Codex Juris Canonici*, which is still valid today, the person who denies the primacy of Rome is a schismatic, but one who denies individual Christian truths is a heretic. Now, since the Vatican Council there have been three dogmas which Orthodoxy does not recognize: papal infallibility and the two Marian dogmas (the immaculate conception and the assumption). The question is therefore no longer merely that of the primacy of the pope.

That this is also recognized in Roman Catholic circles is clear from the article "Schism" in the *Kleines Katholisches Kirchenlexikon* edited by Bernhard Brinkmann, S. J. (Benno Verlag, Leipzig, 1958, which is an authorized version of the edition published by Butzon and Berker, Kevelaer, under the editorship of Bruno Borucki, S. J.). The article concludes: "Since the primacy of the Roman pope was defined as dogma by the Vatican Council, all who deny this (as the Orthodox do) are not only schismatics but also heretics" (p. 303). The fact that the author of the article adds in parentheses "as the Orthodox do" makes it clear that an error in Asmussen's letter should be put right. And the fact that this is stated in a Roman Catholic encyclopaedia bearing the imprimatur of Nikolaus Junk, S. J., *praepositus provinciae germaniae inferioris*, shows that it is not merely the opinion of a Roman Catholic theologian.

HELMUTH KOCH

Nottleben über Erfurt, Germany



## LUTHERAN PUBLISHING IN THE ECUMENICAL ERA

*Lutheran studies in recent years on the subject of church unity show that the question of the relation of Lutheranism to the ecumenical movement must be approached and dealt with differently today than in the theology of bygone decades. From the studies made by the Ecumenical Committee of German Lutheranism in connection with the Lund Faith and Order conference in 1952 to the Minneapolis theses of 1957, an increasing inclination of Lutheranism toward the ecumenical movement is discernible.*

*Anyone within or without Lutheranism who would see in the Lutheran World Federation an alternative to the World Council of Churches mistakes the nature of a confessional organization as well as of the ecumenical movement today. Rather, each is conditioned by the other. The confessional organization is a fact within the ecumenical movement. The latter would today be inconceivable apart from the confessional organization, and the confessional organization would be of no significance whatever if instead of leading to ecumenical work it were to devote itself solely to the protection of its own interests.*

*The relation between the WCC and the various world confessional organizations has recently been made the subject of a very lucid and discerning analysis by Lewis S. Mudge, theological secretary of the World Alliance of Reformed and Presbyterian Churches.<sup>1</sup> "Denominationalism is something essentially pre-ecumenical," says Dr. Mudge, "but world confessionalism as we now know it is an ecumenical phenomenon" (p. 383). The questions and tasks which follow as a result for all churches participating in the ecumenical movement have perhaps never before been related with such clarity to the present discussion of church unity. That Dr. Mudge's essay is not merely the opinion of an isolated individual is shown by statements emanating from the WCC, not least from its general secretary himself. The whole question is made more urgent by the fact that the informal contact established at the meeting of representatives of the confessional movements in Geneva in November, 1957,<sup>2</sup> is evidently being continued and intensified. It is still too early to say what important tasks will fall to this conference in the future, but already at the first meeting one of the tasks agreed upon was "the exchange of literature between the headquarters of these various bodies."<sup>3</sup>*

*This is a sizable task. So far the confessional organizations have not properly fulfilled it, indeed have not even begun to fulfill it. What then does the pastor in Bavaria or Denmark know of what his counterpart in the Lutheran churches of America reads, or in the Tamil Lutheran church? The so-called laymen in our churches are no better informed. What about those whose principal occupation is the production of books?*

*Anyone who knows the present situation in regard to translation and exchange of books knows that publishers themselves are quite aware that they stand on the*

<sup>1</sup> "World Confessionalism and Ecumenical Strategy," *The Ecumenical Review*, July, 1959, p. 379 ff. As Dr. Mudge points out, "The word 'confessional' is applied to the Anglican Communion only as a convenience."

<sup>2</sup> Carl E. Lund-Quist, "Geneva Diary," *Lutheran World*, p. 405.

<sup>3</sup> *Ibid.*



threshold of a development. It is equally clear, however, that questions of exchange of literature must be discussed first with this important vocational group. For the first time in its history, therefore, the Lutheran World Federation convened in Copenhagen on July 27-28 a conference of Lutheran publishers attended by representatives from the USA, the Scandinavian countries and Germany. There was anything but a full representation, for each publishing house addresses itself to an audience which does not necessarily coincide with the church. Already this fact makes it difficult to say what a Lutheran publishing house really is. In Europe moreover a publishing house owned by a church—as many are in the United States—is something almost unheard of; and an attempt to establish such a publishing house would depart so radically from the present system that its chances of succeeding would be small. Even in the United States, however, an author with an established reputation, who addresses himself to a heterogeneous audience, often prefers to submit his books to a secular publishing house. It is also true that all the major church publishing houses in the US are always attempting, often with much success, to transcend the boundaries prescribed by their churches.

A publishing house is of course a business enterprise and in laying its plans must take account of a number of commercial factors. But a church which is resolved, as the Lutheran church is today, to counter the danger of ghettoism in the belief that ghettoism means surrendering the church's very existence and betraying its mission, cannot be indifferent to these same factors. They represent criteria indicating what the man of today is interested in, how he understands himself and the way he can be approached. World Lutheranism is not entrusted with the task of making of one of the great figures of history, as Luther indeed is, a Lutheran saint; nor is it charged with the task of restricting the literature devoted to him or inspired by him to a small circle of initiates. Hence it is always difficult to define a Lutheran publishing house. The reason is to be sought more in the nature of the subject—Luther and the gospel—than in the structure of the publishing business.

Nevertheless there is no question but that our knowledge of the essential literature of the worldwide church is still rudimentary, and, second, that the responsibility for increasing that knowledge falls to a large degree to the confessional organizations. It is easy to deceive oneself about the first difficulty. It appears as if there is already such a thing as an international exchange of thought among theologians. That may be true in some theological disciplines as regards questions relating to those disciplines—biblical and historical theology, for example, or missiology and perhaps others as well. But it is not true for the most part precisely in that branch of theology which is so decisive, systematic theology; nor it is true in the discipline which has grown so immensely, practical theology. The titles of foreign language books sprinkled so liberally in some works of practical theology make the person who has a fair acquaintance with only a few of the titles even more skeptical; often they seem to serve more as ornamentation than as the basis of serious discussion. The review section of this journal, which attempts to offer an



*ecumenical selection of titles, gives perhaps some indication of how difficult—and yet fascinating—is the task that awaits us here.*

*There should also be no doubt about the fact that this task much be assumed in the first place by the world confessional families. The knowledge most of us have of the church of Christ on other continents has been acquired firstly from those to whom we are more closely related by reason of a common confession. Only when we are well acquainted with our confessional brothers and sisters shall we find access to other churches and church groups in foreign countries. Those confessional ties can serve as the starting point for understanding, assessing and possibly appropriating what our national and geographical traditions cause us to look upon at first as strange and unintelligible.*

*It is significant that both the conference of confessional leaders mentioned above and that of the Lutheran publishers in Copenhagen were informal, almost fortuitous in character. As yet we have not found the organizational framework which would be suitable for the treatment of the questions confronting us here. It would be dangerous to establish that framework at a time when there is so much yet to be clarified. That should not deceive us about the importance of such discussions, however. In the 12 years in which the LWF has been in existence, it has developed from an association for fraternal assistance among Lutherans to a spiritual factor of ecumenical significance. In this situation the LWF is confronted by questions crucial for its future existence and activity. To quote Dr. Mudge once more, "Lutheran churches perplex their brethren by what appears to be a fear of what cannot be theologically, i.e. verbally, defined.... Why is this so, and what does it mean? Lutherans must tell us" (p. 390).*

*We should be grateful that questions such as this are put to us with such earnestness and thoroughness. It helps us to see that the exchange of a few so-called "practical" helps, and the rendering of some mutual assistance, does not exhaust the potentialities of an organization like the LWF. The person who makes no effort to understand his fellow Christian at just those points where he strikes him as peculiar is demonstrating either a lack of understanding or love, or both. We still have a great deal to give one another, and as yet we have perhaps in most cases not even perceived the real treasures in the hitherto alien churches of our own confession. The sharing of these treasures could constitute our greatest contribution to the ecumenical movement.*

*Finally, we should also be happy that a group of publishers, consisting mainly of non-theologians, exercises—through their vocation as publishers—an essential function in our common task. That too is basically an ecumenical phenomenon, for "ecumenical" means, more than anything else, depth of dimension—the multifarious spheres of life and vocation which Christ takes into his service. Moreover that service is always service not apparent to the eye, so that in the church there is often a great future for what is begun unpretentiously and at little expense.*

*We would hope that will also be true of the publishers conference in Copenhagen.*

HANS BOLEWSKI



## EDITORIAL NOTES

*It is a great joy and privilege to dedicate this issue of Lutheran World to the past president of the Lutheran World Federation, Bishop Hanns Lilje, on the occasion of his 60th birthday.*

*The articles in this issue deal with questions relating to the Orthodox church and its relation to the ecumenical movement and to Lutheranism. They have been contributed by Prof. EDUARD STEINWAND of the University of Erlangen ; Archbishop IAKOVOS, New York, of the Greek Orthodox Church of North and South America; Prof. HAMILCAR S. ALIVISATOS of the University of Athens; and Prof. GEORGES FLOROVSKY of Harvard Divinity School, Cambridge, Massachusetts.*

*The report of the Lutheran conference in Latin America comes from Dr. STEWART HERMAN, director of the LWF Committee on Latin America, in New York. Dr. WERNER JENTSCH, presently director of the Evangelical Academy in Hofgeismar, Germany, is well acquainted with ecumenical problems through his long years of leadership in the YMCA. Dr. BENGT HOFFMAN, director of the LWF Department of World Service, attended the East Asia Christian Conference in Kuala Lumpur as one of the representatives of the WCC. Pastor HANS-RUEDI WEBER is director of the Department on the Laity of the WCC.*

*Contributing to the "Lands and Churches" section are Dr. FRIEDEBERT LORENZ of the headquarters of the Kirchentag in Fulda; Dr. SIGFRID ESTBORN, professor at Gurukul Theological College and Research Institute in Madras, South India; HERLUF M. JENSEN, executive secretary of the United Student Christian Council, New York; and Prof. HANS HEINRICH WOLF, director of the Ecumenical Institute at Bossey, Switzerland.*

*Book reviews were contributed by Dr. Karl Ferdinand Müller, director of the school of church music in Hannover; Mr. Franklin Sherman of the State University of Iowa; Dr. Martin J. Heineken, Lutheran Theological Seminary, Philadelphia; Dr. Horst Beintker of the University of Greifswald; Dr. Sigurd Aske, associate director of the LWF Department of World Mission; Pastor Conrad Rendtorff, general secretary of the Danish Mission Society; Prof. Arno Lehmann of the University of Halle; Dr. David Löfgren, Lund; and Dr. Vilmos Vajta, director of the LWF Department of Theology.*



LUTHERAN WORLD  
publication of the  
LUTHERAN WORLD FEDERATION

*Editorial Board :*

Dr. Franklin Clark Fry, Bishop Lajos Ordass, Bishop Bo Giertz, Bishop Rajah B. Manikam,  
Dr. Rudolf Weeber, Dr. Carl E. Lund-Quist

*Editor :*

The Rev. Dr. Hans Bolewski,  
Evangelical Academy, Loccum/Wunstorf (Hann.), Germany

*Assistant for the English Language Edition :*

Harold Remus  
17 route de Malagnou, Geneva, Switzerland



# LITERATURE SURVEY

## A REVIEW OF RECENT THEOLOGICAL PUBLICATIONS

PUBLISHED AS A SUPPLEMENT TO LUTHERAN WORLD BY THE DEPARTMENT OF THEOLOGY  
OF THE LUTHERAN WORLD FEDERATION

SEPTEMBER

1959

### *Biblical Theology*

**DIE KULTTRADITION IN DER VERKÜNDIGUNG DES PROPHETEN MICAH** [*Cultic Tradition in the Message of the Prophet Micah*]. (*Forschungen zur Religion und Literatur des Alten und Neuen Testaments, New Series, No. 54.*) By Walter Beyerlin. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck and Ruprecht, 1959. 103 pp., paper, DM 10.80.

For some years now the Wellhausen interpretation of the Old Testament prophets has been questioned. Old Testament research has demonstrated that the traditions of Israel had a firm place in the life of the nation long before the appearance of the first prophets. This doctoral dissertation (Tübingen), from the school of Artur Weiser, attempts to bring to light the traditions underlying the message of the prophet Micah. The author finds, first, that Micah still uses the name "Israel" in the sense of the tribal amphictyony. He shows the continuing influence of both parts of the Sinai tradition: the theophany and the law of the amphictyony, the exodus and the occupation of Canaan. Micah 5:1 ff. draws upon the tradition of the Davidic covenant, which plays a role in Micah's eschatology. All these traditions Micah received via the cult of the Festival of the Covenant in Jerusalem. The author summarizes his findings in answers given to 14 questions raised at the beginning of the work. Micah makes conscious use of the old traditions, that of the law of the amphictyony playing a special role in view of the injustices of his day. The prophet's task consisted in applying the traditions to his own time. Despite his close tie with Israelitic cult Micah cannot be characterized as an official cultic prophet. Rather, his certainty that his word was God's word can be explained only on the basis of his personal experience of revelation.

**JERUSALEM ZUR ZEIT JESU:** *Kulturgeschichtliche Untersuchung zur neutestamentlichen Zeitgeschichte* [Jerusalem at the Time of Jesus: A Study in the Cultural History of New Testament Times]. Second, unrevised edition. By Joachim Jeremias. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck and Ruprecht, 1958. 430 pp., DM 24.00.

For a long time this comprehensive cultural history of Palestine at the time of Jesus has been out of print. The first part treats economic conditions (industry, trade, influx of travelers), the second, social conditions (rich and poor, the upper stratum of society, the preservation of Jewish life and customs). At its first appearance the work advanced significant new viewpoints and necessitated changes in the accepted views of the Sadducees, Pharisees and Scribes (Jeremias showed, e.g., that gnosticism was secretly taught within official Judaism); it thus corrected at various places Bousset's picture of the religion of Judaism.

**DIE PRIESTERSCHRIFT VON EXODUS 25 BIS LEVITICUS 16:** *Eine überlieferungsgeschichtliche und literarkritische Untersuchung* [The Priestly Document, Exodus 25 to Leviticus 16: A Literary and Tradition Critical Study]. (*Forschungen zur Religion und Literatur des Alten und Neuen Testaments, New Series, No. 53.*) By Klaus Koch. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck and Ruprecht, 1959. 108 pp., paper, DM 10.80.

The author teaches Old Testament at the University of Hamburg. His study concerns itself with the prehistory of the portion of the Priestly Code in Ex. 25-Lev. 16. Rolf Rendtorff's work on the rituals in Lev. 1-7 provided some of the inspiration for Koch's study. In his literary critical examination the author finds there are two styles: the imperative style (e.g. Ex. 25:1-9), corresponding to the



style of P, and the formal address (e.g. Ex. 25:23-30). The latter is characteristic of the old ritual, which Koch proceeds to reconstruct from the chapters in question. Alongside the ritual one finds sections of old priestly torah and other cultic traditions. The basic priestly document (Pg) appropriated these old traditions, arranging them in three groups: those concerning ritual and sacred utensils, those relating to sacrifice and those regulating ceremonial cleanness. In the process the old forms more or less lose their identity, a phenomenon which Koch says is typical of the transition from oral to written tradition. The intention of P becomes clear when one examines the way it supplements the original material. The ideas of atonement and purification are stressed and the priest is set apart from the layman. Later the texts were probably reworked but no major changes were made. The ritual in Ezek. 40-48 is treated in the appendix.

**STUDIEN ZU HIOB** [*Studies in Job*]. (*Theologische Arbeiten*, Vol. XI.) By Heinz Richter. Berlin: Evangelische Verlagsanstalt, 1959. 147 pp., DM 8.50.

Based on the work of the school of Joachim Begrich, this formcritical study attempts to solve the problem of the Book of Job by utilizing the categories of law. Previous attempts to interpret the book on the basis of wisdom literature have thrown some light on it, says the author, but the element basic to the whole of the drama of Job is the legal trial which the writer used to confront his readers with a true understanding of God. "The prose framework and the poem constitute a unity and viewed together offer a solution of the problem of the book." The author draws upon the prevailing theory of God's righteousness to show that God's dealings with man are not "just" in the juridical sense, that they are rather motivated by his grace. Writing in a time of sterile piety, the author of Job wants to lead his people back to the true knowledge of God. From the beginning of the drama to the end he wants to impress upon them that God's dealings are not subject to human calculation. Yet in all his dealings God, the absolute Lord, also remains the God of grace. Only the prose framework and the poem taken together give the full truth: God seeks to justify man. The author comes to this conclusion after an exact analysis of the book

itself and after making a comparison with the legal thought of Babylonia and Egypt.

**DAS MOSEBILD VON HEINRICH EWALD BIS MARTIN NOTH** [*Moses—in Old Testament Research from Heinrich Ewald to Martin Noth*]. (*Beiträge zur Geschichte der biblischen Exegese*, No. 3.) By Rudolf Smend. Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck), 1959. vii and 80 pp., paper, DM 8.80.

A prize essay at the school of theology of Basel university, this work traces the picture of Moses produced by Old Testament research of the past 150 years. Chapter one begins with the question of historical sources; as the foundation of efforts to reconstruct a historical figure, they first captured the interest of scholars. Their work on the text did not yield a clear picture of Moses, however. Reasoning back from post-Mosaic times, or from Moses' environment, also led to unsatisfactory results, especially since so many of these attempts operated with an idealistic understanding of personality or were animated by the concept of development (chapter two). A third approach was through the religious types offered by the phenomenology of religion. None of these types corresponded exactly with what tradition reported of Moses, however (chapter three). Following Jaspers, Smend believes that the most promising approach is to attempt to arrive at an overall picture of Moses, based on exegesis but conditioned by a full consciousness of the limits of the historico-critical method. He regards Martin Buber's *Moses* as a model effort to intuit a picture of Moses. Every attempt to portray Moses is haunted by the fact that the scholar operates with certain presuppositions which influence his portrayal. The problems are largely the same as those encountered in the attempts to write a life of Jesus. While the methods are the same, the decisive difference between the two attempts lies in the significance of the two figures whom we reach out to across the millennia.

**STUDIER I RABBINSK OCH NYTESTAMENTLIG SKRIFTTOLKNING** [*Studies in the Rabbinic and New Testament Interpretation of Scripture*]. By Erik Starfelt. Lund: C. W. K. Gleerups, 1959. 307 pp., Sw. Kr. 30.00.



In the first main section of this work the author analyzes the presuppositions and methods of rabbinic interpretation of the Old Testament. He emphasizes that the question of the logical and philological "correctness" of the exegesis of that time should not be our primary concern. We must rather try to understand to what extent that exegesis, which we are unable to make our own, was possible for the rabbis and of value to them; in this spirit the author makes a detailed analysis of rabbinic exegesis. He shows that while the influence of classical rhetoric is evident, one can understand the rules of that rhetoric really only by going back to the characteristic pattern of rabbinic interpretation of the Old Testament. The second main section examines the New Testament's interpretation of the Old. The author begins by analyzing the Old Testament quotations in Acts 1-3, comparing the interpretation of these passages there with that given them by the rabbis. In these three chapters Starfelt finds there are three ways in which quotations from the Old Testament are selected: (1) directly from a collection of Hebrew texts; (2) from already existing Greek translations, and (3) in a new translation and interpretation of Semitic texts. The author also seeks to show that the New Testament interpretation of Scripture is primarily typological. Inasmuch as the New Testament favors the typological to the literal sense of an Old Testament passage, the unity of the New Testament's interpretation is to be found not in a few fixed rules of hermeneutics but in the special way in which the Old Testament is fulfilled and has its unity in Christ. Hence the Old Testament passages quoted in the New Testament are not "proofs" in the traditional sense of the word; rather, like the miracles in the New Testament, they testify to Christ. At the end of the book there is a summary of the contents in English.

**WEISHEIT UND TORHEIT:** *Eine exegetisch-religionsgeschichtliche Untersuchung zu 1. Kor. 1 und 2* [Wisdom and Foolishness: 1 Cor. 1 and 2 Examined Exegetically and in the Light of Comparative Religion]. (Beiträge zur historischen Theologie, No. 26.) By Ulrich Wilckens. Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck), 1959. vi and 299 pp., DM 28.70.

Paul's discourse on wisdom and foolishness—"the most important problem for

him"—presents scholars with tasks they have hitherto taken too little account of. Opposing the opinion that in 1 Cor. Paul is using Hellenistic concepts to develop his teaching, the author posits the thesis that "Paul's development of his argument is characterized by polemic against gnosticism" (p. 3). The question then is, Against which *sophia* doctrine is Paul writing? Part one is an exegesis of 1 Cor. 1:18 to 2:16 ("Context: Chapters 1-4"; "The Problem of the Unity of the Corinthian Church"; "Excursus on the Concepts *teleios* and *psychikos*"). Part two examines the *religionsgeschichtlich* background of the *sophia* concept (pp. 97-213) and part three (pp. 214-224) the basic concern and the structure of the Pauline preaching of the cross. Paul's purpose was not to debate with the Corinthians' philosophical ambitions; he rather sees the battle lines drawn against the wisdom of the world of "all mankind, both Jews and Gentiles" (p. 221). Particularly important is the author's development of the whole *sophia* idea and his interpretation of Paul's theology vis-à-vis the gnostic myth of the descent of the redeemer. The event of the cross opposes the gnostic doctrine of redemption with its slogan of "all things are ours." The cross is for Paul "the Christians' source of salvation, and in order to bring this center of his christology to the fore he must relate the Corinthian concepts of *sophia* and *sophos* to the cross. In the process they take on meaning completely opposite to their original meaning" (p. 99). For Paul the crucifixion is not, as gnosticism interpreted it, an intermediate stage, an event which did not really happen and did not really affect Christ. The cross is rather God's act and thus a redemptive event in which Christ—the crucified of God—is "wisdom." Part four proceeds from the Pauline preaching of the cross to a clarification of the relation of this preaching to Greek philosophy (Stoicism).

## Historical Theology

**LUTHER UND DER PAPST** [Luther and the Pope]. (*Theologische Existenz heute*, Heft 69.) By Ernst Bizer. Munich: Christian Kaiser Verlag, 1958. 56 pp., DM 3.50.

This is in effect a continuation of the author's earlier work *Fides ex auditu* (see *Literature Survey*, No. 2, 1958), furnishing



evidence for the thesis in the previous book that Luther's discovery of Rom. 1:17 led to his struggle with the pope. Luther's attitude to the pope passes through a number of phases, says Bizer, who is professor of church history in Bonn. In the period of the reformatory discovery (which the author places around 1518) Luther envisaged no rejection of the papacy in principle. With his assertion that the pope is subject to a council and to Scripture, Luther was simply championing the conciliar theory of the 15th century. Even upon discovering shortly thereafter on the basis of his exegesis of Matt. 16 and Jn. 21 that "primacy" belongs to the church, he still conceded the papacy's right to existence as an order *de jure humano* based, like all secular power, on Rom. 13 and belonging to the sphere of the law. The fundamental change in Luther's thinking came with the papal bull of 1520: because he saw that the pope was here placing himself, a human, above the truth of the gospel, Luther broke conclusively with the papacy. In the controversy that began in 1536 over the calling of a council, Luther came to the conclusion (expressed in the Smalcald Articles) that the pope is the Antichrist; anyone who distorts and destroys the truth of God is not neutral toward God, he is acting as an adversary of God. In the writing of 1545, *Against the Roman Papacy Established by the Devil*, Luther finally places the papacy and Enthusiasm on one level. Both speak and act on their own authority, an authority with neither secular nor ecclesiastical sanction and with no foundation in Scripture.

GESAMMELTE SCHRIFTEN. BAND II: KIRCHENKAMPF UND FINKENWALDE. REVOLUTIONEN, AUFSÄTZE, RUNDBRIEFE, 1933-1943 [*Collected Writings. Vol. 2: The Church Struggle and Finkenwalde. Revolutions, Essays and Letters, 1933-1943*]. By Dietrich Bonhoeffer. Edited by Eberhard Bethge. Munich: Christian Kaiser Verlag, 1959. 667 pp., paper, DM 23.20, cloth, DM 26.00.

This volume has two purposes: (1) to show through letters, essays and documents Bonhoeffer's part in the struggle of the Confessing Church from 1933-1943; (2) to contribute to an understanding of developments in the church in those years. Part one, "The Church Struggle," shows Bonhoeffer in his battle, within himself and without, with the "German Christians," and in his championing

of the Confessing Church. Here is found the Bethel Confession of 1933 written by Bonhoeffer and Hermann Sasse against accepting the Aryan paragraphs in the church. From 1933 to 1935 Bonhoeffer was German pastor in London. Separated geographically from the church's struggles in Germany, he was present all the more in spirit, as becomes evident particularly from his correspondence with Karl Barth and the Bishop of Chichester, G. K. A. Bell. His basic attitude toward the Confessing Church is found in his essay on "The Question of Church Fellowship"; he makes clear that the question of fellowship in the church is a question of salvation. This leads him to the assertion, hotly disputed at the time, that anyone who knowingly separates himself from the Confessing Church is cutting himself off from salvation (p. 238). The letters and other pieces written during the war and before his arrest in 1943 give a picture of Bonhoeffer's concern over the church in the future; this comes out particularly in his outline of an announcement to be made from the pulpit after Germany was defeated. Part two takes the reader into the daily life and work of the seminary of the Confessing Church in Finkenwalde, which was under Bonhoeffer's direction from 1935 to 1940, when it was finally dissolved. Here we have the context out of which grew his *Life Together*. It was also the time which was most fruitful for his profession and his person. Numerous letters to young pastors who were living under the most trying conditions and with no material security show the intensity of his pastoral work. In this as in the previous volume there are German translations of the English letters and a list of the sources drawn upon.

WESTERN ASCETICISM. (*The Library of Christian Classics, Vol. XII.*) Edited by Owen Chadwick. Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1958. 368 pp., \$5.00.

The Dixie Professor of Ecclesiastical History at the University of Cambridge has provided us with a new edition of three important documents of the early Christian church: *The Sayings of the Fathers*, *The Conferences of Cassian*, and *The Rule of Saint Benedict*. The *Sayings*, comprising more than half of the entire book, are derived from the 6th century Latin version of the rule of life of the hermits along the banks of the Nile. In the *Conferences*, John Cassian reproduces



some of the conversations and teachings of the Egyptian ascetics of the desert. *The Rule of Saint Benedict* of Nursia deals with all aspects of the monastic life and is noted for its stress on the spiritual qualities of obedience, humility and patience. Introductions, an appendix of variant textual readings, and a selected bibliography round out the volume.

#### WIE LUTHER KIRCHENZUCHT ÜBTE:

*Eine kritische Untersuchung von Luthers Bannsprüchen und ihrer exegetischen Grundlegung aus der Sicht unserer Zeit [Luther and Church Discipline: A Critical Examination of Luther's Excommunications and their Exegetical Foundation]. (Theologische Arbeiten, Vol. IX.) By Ruth Götze. Berlin: Evangelische Verlagsanstalt, 1959. 148 pp., DM 8.50.*

The subject of this Berlin doctoral dissertation was suggested by Rudolph Hermann. The sources are Luther's letters, the *Table Talks* and other documents in which there appear instances where Luther or his associates threatened, recommended or actually carried out excommunication. Appended to the study is an evaluation for the present day: "A Systematic Consideration of Luther's Practice of Excommunication and a Discussion of the Problems" (pp. 102-113); "Luther's Use of Scripture in Connection with Excommunication" (pp. 114-127); "Luther's Criticism of the Structure of Church Discipline and Present-day Problematics" (p. 128 ff.). In Luther's practice of excommunication the author sees "the difficult problem of distinguishing the two kingdoms," a problem "which Luther was not able to solve in practice" (p. 105). The chief characteristic of the Reformation practice of excommunication is its emphasis on Christian compassion and the measures taken when that compassion was violated. In defense of this practice Luther always pointed to Matt. 18:15 ff. and Ezek. 3:17 ff. The author draws especially on 1 Cor. 5:1 ff. and Rev. 2 and 3 in examining Luther's and contemporary exegesis. The reluctance of the New Testament (and of Luther) to carry out disciplinary action and excommunications obligates us to exercise discipline only with the "rod of the mouth"—the word of admonition, guidance and warning.

#### DIE RELIGIONEN DER MENSCHHEIT IN VERGANGENHEIT UND GEGENWART [The Religions of Mankind in Past and

Present]. By Friedrich Heiler, in collaboration with Kurt Goldammer, Franz Hesse, Günter Lanczowski, Käthe Neumann, Annemarie Schimmel. Stuttgart: Reclam-Verlag, 1959. 1064 pp., 48 plates.

In collaboration with colleagues of the "Marburg School," Heiler, professor of religions at the University of Marburg, discusses all the religions which have been of any consequence in the history of mankind. He groups them under civilizations and periods, giving special attention to the world religions of the present day, including Christianity. A short introduction on the phenomenology of religion throws light on the treatment of individual religions which follows. In each of the presentations the author gives a sympathetic evaluation of the sources and the founder, followed by a discussion of the forms and order of worship and leading up to the religion's conception of salvation. The presentation always takes account of the peculiarities of the religion being treated. Changes in the religions in the course of history are also traced and the influence of one religion upon another noted. For the most part the book is abreast of the latest research. As becomes evident in the discussion of the Qumran community, the book has been written in a spirit of religious tolerance, in the belief that there is "one religion and a limitless variety of manifestations."

VON DER KLARHEIT DER HEILIGEN SCHRIFT. *Untersuchungen und Erörterungen über Luthers Lehre von der Schrift [The Clarity of Scripture: Studies of Luther's Doctrine of Scripture]. By Rudolf Hermann. Berlin: Evangelische Verlagsanstalt, 1958. 126 pp., DM 4.20.*

Hermann, Luther scholar in Berlin, here deals with a special aspect of Luther's doctrine of Scripture, namely, his treatment of the clarity and perspicuity of Scripture in *The Bondage of the Will*. He begins with an examination of Luther's conception of *assertiones*, i.e., affirmations necessary to faith. He then presents Luther's teaching on the external clarity of Scripture, and gives a critical examination of it. On Easter morn the seal on the tomb was broken; in the same way Christ opens one's eyes to an understanding of Scripture. Hermann then relates the problem to the questions of the canon and doctrinal norm. The inner clarity



of Scripture comes only through faith and is closely related to faith in God's justification of the sinner and to certainty of salvation. Here the author finds serious faults with Luther's thought, especially with the way he sometimes draws upon natural theology. Hermann also discusses the relation between literal and tropological exegesis in Luther. Two excursions on Luther's exegesis of certain Scripture passages conclude the study.

**UNDERSTANDING ROMAN CATHOLICISM.** By Winthrop S. Hudson. Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1959. 192 pp., \$3.50.

The Baptist author is Professor of the History of Christianity at Colgate-Rochester Divinity School. His purpose is to permit Roman Catholicism to interpret itself through modern papal pronouncements from Leo XIII to Pius XII. Attention is centered on some distinctive features of Catholicism since the crucial decrees of the Vatican Council of 1870. An analysis of the very important "First Dogmatic Constitution of the Church of Christ" (1870) constitutes the first chapter. Here "Roman obedience" is developed as "the most distinctive feature of the faith." A second chapter on "The Christian Constitution of States" sets forth the heart of modern Roman political theory as enunciated in the encyclical letters of Leo XIII. An analysis of "Christian democracy" follows in which it is demonstrated, for instance, how the American Roman church is able to adapt itself in practice to a political system which it cannot accept in principle. A final chapter on "Catholic Action" describes the responsibilities (and limits) of the laity in implementing the church's program for society.

**DIE ETHIK SCHLEIERMACHERS** [*Schleiermacher's Ethics*]. By Poul Jørgensen. Munich: Christian Kaiser Verlag, 1959. 222 pp., DM 13.50.

This work grew out of a prize essay written at the University of Copenhagen. It is more a philosophical than a theological study, although, particularly in the last chapter, the author also discusses theological questions and problems. After examining Schleiermacher's ontology, he discusses the relation of his epistemology to his ontology and the relation

between his ethics and his ontology. The author is quite critical of Schleiermacher, especially of his ontology. According to Schleiermacher ethics are to be heuristic, seeking to discover the eternal in the temporal, an approach found already in Plato. Jørgensen shows that this antithesis is in Schleiermacher really not an antithesis. Schleiermacher's ethic of the individual and his view of evil rest in his ontology, and are criticized by the author on this basis. Schleiermacher opposes an ethic of the indicative to an ethic of the imperative; he did not see, says Jørgensen, the dialectic between indicative and imperative in the New Testament. The relation between ethics and religion is developed on the basis of Schleiermacher's conception of feeling. Dialectic is the basis of his philosophical and Christian ethics. Christian ethics in Schleiermacher are the "setting forth of the fellowship with God as conditioned by fellowship with Christ, insofar as this fellowship is the motive of all the Christian's actions." Finally Schleiermacher's concept of the church is developed on the basis of his ethics.

**DIE LEHRE VOM KULTUS DER LUTHERISCHEN KIRCHE ZUR ZEIT DER ORTHODOXIE** [*The Teaching of the Lutheran Church on Worship in the Age of Orthodoxy*]. (*Arbeiten zur Geschichte und Theologie des Luthertums, Bd. III.*) By Friedrich Kalb. Berlin: Lutherisches Verlagshaus, 1959. 152 pp., DM 13.80.

By analyzing worship and teaching on worship in the age of Lutheran orthodoxy, the author hopes to make a contribution to current discussion of the new order of worship being introduced in Germany. The conclusion of part one ("The Nature of Worship") is that the Lutheran theologians of the 17th century preserved, for the most part, the basic motif of Luther's conception of the worship service, namely that it is the summation of Christian faith and of God's work in behalf of man. Worship is seen against the background of the history of salvation, in relation to worship before the Fall and under the old covenant and looking forward to worship in eternity. In orthodoxy's explanation of the worship of regenerate man, however, an approach that is unevangelical and legalistic becomes evident, says the author; this is to be accounted for by orthodoxy's emphasis on the third use of the



law; it can be seen in the way the orthodox theologians employ arguments from the Old Testament (e.g. worship is a celebration of the Sabbath). Part two ("The Structure of the Service") tries to demonstrate that orthodoxy, in contrast to the pietism which followed it, was keenly aware of the necessity of external forms, even though the reasons given were often highly pedagogical and legalistic in tone. The heart of worship remained the presence of Christ in word and sacrament. Kalb is critical of orthodoxy's attitude toward the so-called "adiaphora" in the service which were retained for the most part but were justified only with negative theological arguments. This paved the way for the later decline of Lutheran worship, says Kalb. Our task today is to find our way back to positive theological bases of worship forms. The author calls especially for such rethinking with regard to the music used in worship. Orthodoxy, he says, allotted a place in its system only to vocal music; he shows that the "new style" of a Schütz or a Bach already transcended those criteria. Part three ("The Relation between the Nature and the Structure of Worship") deals briefly with the struggle of orthodoxy with tendencies which isolated the essence of worship from its structure through one-sided emphasis upon the "inner worship" of the pious individual. Another struggle was with the mystical ideas that found their way into orthodoxy through many channels and left their imprint there in the teaching on the *unio mystica*. The final conclusion of the author is that on the whole the age of orthodoxy faithfully preserved the Reformation heritage.

LUTHER. (*Sammlung Götschen, Bd. 1187.*)  
By Franz Lau. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter Verlag, 1959. 148 pp., DM 3.60.

Lau is professor of church history at Leipzig. The introductory chapter of this brief biography of Luther is entitled "The Picture of Luther through the Centuries" and concentrates on the seeming paradox that while Luther is one of those figures who have been the object of comprehensive historical research, he has been subjected to the most various and contradictory interpretations. Although Luther research of recent decades has made decisive contributions to our understanding of the reformer, for a further clarification of his theology additional study of his hermeneutics is necessary, says Lau. Only in

this way will we be able to see to what extent Luther draws upon the theology of the late Middle Ages and to what extent he goes his own way. The picture of Luther in its decisive stages is then drawn against the background of the social, intellectual and ecclesiastical world of the 16th century. The conclusion is an evaluation of Luther and his work. The author states that if Luther is seen only in his significance for Germany and German culture, he is a quite ambiguous figure; his unique significance for Christendom lies in his alerting it to the question of truth, not in the sense that he is to be regarded as the forerunner of modern subjectivism but in the sense that he points Christendom to the chief truth—the word of God, which Luther placed above all other truth.

LUTHER'S WORKS. Vol. 23: SERMONS ON THE GOSPEL OF ST. JOHN. Edited by Jaroslav Pelikan. St. Louis: Concordia Publishing House, 1959. xi and 446 pp., \$6.00.

LUTHER'S WORKS. Vol. 51: SERMONS I. Edited by John W. Doberstein. Philadelphia: Muhlenberg Press, 1959. xxi and 405 pp., \$5.00.

The two latest volumes of the new American edition of Luther give a glimpse into the Reformer's prodigious preaching activity, in the belief that in their faithfulness to the word and in their objectivity Luther's sermons have something to say also to the preachers and congregations of the present. The two volumes are quite different in arrangement. The sermons on John (chapters 6-8), translated by Martin H. Bertram and edited by Jaroslav Pelikan, represent a thematic whole; Luther was substituting in the pulpit of the town church of Wittenberg for Bugenhagen, who was in Lübeck, and these are the Saturday sermons he preached. In general the edition follows Aurifaber's transcript of the sermons printed in WA XXIII; some changes and additions have been made on the basis of the Heidelberg manuscript, also printed in WA XXIII.

The Muhlenberg volume, translated and edited by John R. Doberstein, professor of practical theology at Lutheran Theological Seminary in Philadelphia, sets out to give a cross-section of Luther's total preaching activity. There are 43 sermons (arranged chronologically) delivered at various places



and on various occasions, beginning with the first sermon we have by Luther (text, Mt. 7:12) down to the last sermon he preached (on February 15, 1546). The editor has attempted to make an objective selection from the many sermons available. The introduction deals at length with the nature and style of Luther's sermons and with their transmission. Preceding each sermon are brief remarks on the historical background and the transmission of the text. Indexes of names and Scripture passages are appended to each volume. Like the previous Concordia volumes this one also gives on each page the corresponding page numbers of the Weimar *Ausgabe*.

**SCHRIFTGEBRAUCH, SCHRIFTAUSLEGUNG UND SCHRIFTBEWEIS BEI AUGUSTIN** [*Augustine's Use and Exegesis of Scripture, and his Proof from Scripture*]. By Gerhard Strauss. Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck), 1959. vi and 160 pp., DM 12.00.

Augustine and Scripture is the subject of this work, originally a doctoral thesis at Göttingen University. In Augustine's thought Scripture originally seems to occupy only a provisional place as the bridge between God and the *anima* (chapter 1). The author shows, however, that Augustine nevertheless considered Scripture of special importance. The scope of Scripture is limited by the church, it is inspired by the Spirit and is to be understood according to the rule of faith; hence Scripture has a certain provisional character as *instrumentum*. Finally, however, with the help of rhetoric, the metaphysical aspect of language, and hermeneutics, Augustine came to regard Scripture as of special importance. Because he attempted to understand Scripture against the background of metaphysics, Augustine applied alien categories to it. In Augustine's thought, more so than in Luther, the suspicion arises that he sought to prove through Scripture what he already knew. "This in no way lessens the richness of thought of Augustine's exposition of Scripture." From Augustine's definition of the relation between *credere* and *intelligere* it follows that an exact distinction cannot be drawn between his interpretation of Scripture and his use of Scripture as proof. Augustine's conception of the Trinity shows especially clearly, says the author, how Augustine looked for and found an answer to a question imposed on Scripture.

**INDIVIDEN OCH SAMFUNDET. BIDRAG TILL KAENNEDOMEN OM SAMFUNDSTAENKANDET I SWENSK KYRKOTIDNING 1855-1863** [*The Individual and the Church: Toward an Understanding of the Churchly Orientation of Thought in Svensk Kyrkotidning, 1855-1863*]. By Erik Wallgren. Lund: C. W. K. Gleerups, 1959. 426 pp., Sw. Kr. 25.00.

A hundred years ago the theological faculty in Lund constituted a remarkably cohesive group. This fact found expression in a paper edited from 1855 to 1863 by three of the professors, *Swensk Kyrkotidning*. Their common approach to theology enabled them to feel themselves responsible for all contributions to the paper. Their agreement was of great significance for theological discussion in Sweden in the middle of the 19th century. Now for the first time their thinking has been made the subject of systematic analysis. The chief problem at that time was the invasion of the older traditions by individualism, both in the form of liberalism and of the revivalist piety colored by Pietism. From different quarters came the call for freedom of religion and conscience. Of special interest is the detailed treatment of the concept of the church; the Lundensian theologians were at distinct odds with the theology of Uppsala which was more receptive to the demands of the revival movement. The main element in the Lundensians' concept of the church is the idea of the church as an organism which in its effect is like an objective institution of salvation; with this conception the Lundensians hoped to counter the new tendencies with the Reformation view. At the end of the book there is a summary of the contents in German.

## Systematic Theology

**REFORMATION OCH KATOLICITET** [*The Reformation and Catholicity*]. By Gustaf Aulén. Stockholm: Svenska Kyrkans Diakonistyrelses Bokförlag, 1959. 264 pp., Sw. Kr. 17.50.

This book is intended as a contribution to the present debate on the Reformation. The introductory chapter gives an account of the ways in which the various churches of Christendom regard the Reformation, special



emphasis being laid upon the views of Roman Catholic authors (e.g. L. Bouyer, Y. Congar and D. Barsotti). The next chapter discusses the heart of the Reformation's confession, justification by faith, which Aulén says is an assertion of the continuing work of redemption which the living Christ, present and acting in word and sacrament, carries out in the church. Chapter three seeks to show the relation of the Reformation confession of faith to that of the Bible and the ancient church, the author attempting to demonstrate that all have their unity in the confession of God as Lord. In the confessions of both the ancient church and the Reformation, the apostolic confession of Christ is used as the key to the real meaning and inner aim of Scripture. The varied accents of the various confessions are traceable to the various historical situations in which they arose; that does not mean, however, that these confessions are not similar in content. In chapter four Aulén shows that the Reformation's attitude toward tradition is not to reject it but to distinguish between false and true tradition. It is also erroneous, says Aulén, to say that the establishing of the formal authority of Scripture is characteristic of the Reformation; what is characteristic is that Scripture was approached with the apostolic "kyrios key." Aulén then discusses all this in the various areas in which the problem of Scripture and tradition appears: doctrine, liturgy and order. In the concluding chapter on "Catholicity," the author criticizes the usual division of Christendom into two types, "Catholic" and "Protestant," for "Catholicity," he says, means universality and continuity.

**BIBLICAL INTERPRETATION.** By E. C. Blackman. Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1959. 212 pp., \$3.00.

This is an American publication of a book which originally appeared in London in 1957 through the Independent Press. Blackman argues both against the approach to the Bible which begins and ends with criticism, and the unrealistic attitude of excessive conservatism. For him, the meaning of revelation is discovered in the person of Christ; Christ is to be identified with the word of God, whereas the Bible is at best identified with the word in a derived sense. Its authority is therefore not derived from the record, but from the acts recorded. The

development of exegesis from the early rabbinic period through the Reformation is examined with special reference to the allegorical method of interpretation, and Blackman expresses his sympathies with the fundamental concern which promoted this method. Basic presuppositions, aims, and objects of modern criticism are then traced; his principal judgment against modern criticism is that it has not always kept in mind the "distinctiveness of the subject-matter of the Bible" and that it has not put its conclusions to use in releasing the central issues of the Bible. Blackman pleads for more attention to biblical theology, without neglecting criticism. "There is need for a new positive exposition of the Bible which will do for the twentieth century what the Reformation did for the sixteenth." He advocates a "christological" interpretation of the Bible, distinct from allegorical, spiritualizing, and mystical interpretations; but he also believes that Vischer, for example, is too subjective. He suggests that after a passage is studied textually and historically, it be searched for what it teaches about (1) God, (2) man, (3) the world and the whole of mankind, and (4) the church and redeemed society. "The drawing out of the spiritual sense of Scripture is equivalent to the preservation of it as God's living word which becomes contemporary for every generation."

**THE CASE FOR A NEW REFORMATION THEOLOGY.** By William Hordern. Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1959. 176 pp., \$3.50.

**THE CASE FOR THEOLOGY IN LIBERAL PERSPECTIVE.** By L. Harold De Wolf. Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1959. 206 pp., \$3.50.

**THE CASE FOR ORTHODOX THEOLOGY.** By Edward J. Carnell. Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1959. 162 pp., \$3.50.

The purpose of this trilogy is to present comparative "cases" for these current theological points of view. The case for a new Reformation theology is presented by William Hordern, Associate Professor of Systematic Theology at Garrett Biblical Institute. He acknowledges dependence upon the works of Aulén, the Baillies, Barth, Brunner, Niebuhr and Kierkegaard. The scandal of God's self-revelation is central. The case for liberal theology is made by L. Harold De Wolf,



Professor of Systematic Theology at Boston University School of Theology. While taking his stand with no existing "school," the author's system employs insights from such modern thinkers as Bennett, Knudson, Temple and Williams. The author contends strongly for the validity of natural theology. Finally, the case for classical Protestant orthodoxy is spelled out by Edward Carnell, Professor of Apologetics at Fuller Theological Seminary. He is primarily concerned with restating the Reformed position as formulated in the Heidelberg Catechism, the Canons of the Synod of Dort and the Westminster Confession. The verbal inspiration of the Bible is defended as the foundation of Christian faith and life. All three texts contain notes, indexes and general bibliographies of texts written in a similar spirit.

**GLAUBE UND WIRKLICHKEIT: EINE STUDIE ZUM EXISTENTIELLEN GLAUBENSVERSTÄNDNIS** [*Faith and Reality: An Existential Interpretation of Faith*]. By John Cullberg. Hamburg: Furche Verlag, 1958. 108 pp., DM 8.80.

A translation of a work which appeared originally in Swedish, this is an attempt to give an existential interpretation of faith. The author, Bishop of Västerås, Sweden, examines the reality of the object of faith, i.e. he raises the basic question of religious truth. He limits the question to the religion "of the second person," i.e. to the Christian faith as the religion in which the relation between man and God is that of I and Thou. The question of truth is therefore, Is the Thou of the community of faith real? In the second chapter the author then treats the problem of reality from the epistemological standpoint; he analyzes the existential I-Thou relationship, contrasting it with other theories of knowledge. Chapter three is, accordingly, an examination of the question of God's reality from the standpoint of the I-Thou relationship; the author at the same time draws the immediate consequences for the interpretation of dogma and our conception of worship. The final chapter raises the question of the reality of evil, seen as the derangement of the I-Thou relation between God and man.

**ENGAGEMENT AND MARRIAGE.** *A Sociological, Historical and Theological Investigation of Engagement and Marriage.* St.

Louis: Concordia Publishing House, 1959. 193 pp., \$3.00.

This book grew out of the work of the Family Life Committee of the Lutheran Church—Missouri Synod. The study was undertaken to investigate the question, long disputed in the church body, of the significance of engagement in relation to marriage. At the same time the book offers a glimpse into the theological study and the formulation of doctrine going on within this church; its previous official doctrinal pronouncements had maintained that engagement is tantamount to marriage. The examination of the Old Testament statements underlying these pronouncements reveals, however, that aside from the institution of the marriage relationship in Genesis, the statements on the Hebrew marriage laws reflect for the most part the thinking common to the ancient orient. While the New Testament defines the content of marriage as an indissoluble ordinance of God, it says nothing about its form that goes beyond 1 Thess. 4:4. The consent theory prevailing in the Middle Ages and traceable primarily to Thomas Aquinas, rests on both natural law and Roman canon law, but not on Scripture. The Reformation retained a large segment of this conception of marriage. Yet from Luther on marriage and the legal questions connected with it were regarded as belonging to the "kingdom of this world." Marriage therefore became a matter to be regulated by the state. For the conception of marriage in the church, the 19th century's legal regulations and social customs pertaining to engagement cannot be regarded as normative. Here the authors feel they are in agreement with the majority of contemporary Roman Catholic and Protestant theologians. In conclusion, engagement is defined in accordance with current psychological and sociological conditions as a decisive step in the preparation for marriage.

**CHRISTLICHER GLAUBE. IN SEINER AUSEINANDERSETZUNG MIT DEN MÄCHTEN, FRAGEN, NÖTEN DER GEGENWART UND IN SEINER WAHRHEIT ERFASST UND DARGESTELLT.** *I. Teil: Die Botschaft des Evangeliums in der Kritik der menschlichen Erfahrung und des menschlichen Denkens* [*The Christian Faith Confronts the Powers, Problems and Stresses of the Present. Part I: The Gospel in the*



*Crucible of Human Experience and Thought*]. By Emil Fuchs. Halle (Saale): VEB Max Niemeyer Verlag, 1958. 219 pp., DM 12.40.

This is an attempt to portray the Christian faith in its encounter with the modern world, especially Marxist ideology. Drawing upon a number of theologians past and present, the author, systematician at Leipzig University, seeks to show that faith is personal encounter with Jesus Christ, not doctrines or a system. There is positive value in atheism, he argues, inasmuch as it is at bottom nothing but a striving for truth and the ultimately valid. That search comes to fruition only in the encounter with living reality, however, not in doctrine or in an organized church striving for influence. Fuchs argues for basing the certainty of faith on personal encounter between one person and another. With respect to modern currents of thought influencing our present-day world, he says that while it is not within their power to apprehend ultimate reality, there is in each of them truth and power which is to be assessed positively and accorded recognition by faith. They are, however, to be sharply distinguished from revelation which Christ alone discloses to us. In the last chapter the author attempts to show that the church has failed with respect to the needs and distresses of the recent past, but that there was something of historical necessity in this failure and new forces are now at work which are reshaping the world. This the church must accept, concentrating on its task of calling men to encounter with Christ from the vantage point of its new understanding of the gospel.

**SKANDALON. UM DAS WESEN DES KATHOLIZISMUS** [*Skandalon: On the Nature of Roman Catholicism*]. By Joseph Klein. Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck), 1958. 464 pp., paper, DM 25.00, cloth, DM 29.00.

The author was at one time professor of Roman Catholic canon law and is now professor of the history of philosophy at Göttingen University. *Skandalon* is a collection of lectures and addresses, most of them previously unpublished. The collection is not fortuitous, says the author; "there is unity to the thought and consistency in its development." The book shows how the author's thought developed during his lifetime as he

concerned himself, historically and systematically, with the nature of Roman Catholicism. The author has appropriated Rudolf Sohm's thesis that the nature of canon law is in essential contradiction to the nature of the church. The crying need of our time is a radical separation of church and state, he says. In this respect neither Roman Catholicism nor Protestantism has perceived the task that has been cut out for them. The majority of the lectures deal with questions and problems from the area of canon law. For instance, the bases, boundaries and importance of canon law are examined; canon law is brought face to face with modern legal thought, and there is a treatment of the conception of marriage in the *Codex Iuris Canonici*. Philosophical questions are also broached: basic problems of Thomist ethics, the origins of casuistry and its limits, the origins and goals of Neothomism. Two addresses delivered to non-academic audiences are concerned with the actualizing of the Christian faith from the Roman Catholic and Protestant points of view. The book offers a picture of Roman Catholicism more in accord with the facts than that generally held. A goodly portion of the author's criticism is directed at both Protestantism and Roman Catholicism, e.g. his reminder that Christianity can only benefit if all churches and confessions are given equal freedom.

**WORSHIP IN WORD AND SACRAMENT.** By Ernest B. Koenker. St. Louis: Concordia Publishing House, 1959. 109 pp., \$1.50.

The author, a member of the faculty of Valparaiso University (Indiana), seeks to draw together the concerns and results of the liturgical movement. His starting point is the Lutheran understanding of worship as God's action in word and sacrament calling forth the response of the congregation in prayer and praise. In today's mass society he attaches special significance to the power of worship to establish community: the *ecclesia orans* is the highest and only authentic form of community "since its basis is a common Lordship rather than kinship or locality" (p. 35). Through worship the congregation avoids the dangers of collectivism and individualism. Although the liturgical movement is sometimes in danger of appropriating elements for which there is no theological justification, and although



it always sees itself confronted by reprimanding and "Catholicizing" tendencies, its chief concern—the emphasis upon the sacramental side of worship—is correct. Other chapters deal with the mutual relations between art and worship, and the liturgy and culture. In the final chapter, "From Worship to One's Daily Work," the author sketches the significance of worship for the Christian's daily witness to Christ.

**RELIGION AND CULTURE: ESSAYS IN HONOR OF PAUL TILLICH.** Edited by Walter Leibrecht. New York: Harper and Brothers, 1959. 399 pp., \$7.50.

The editor is a former associate of Prof. Tillich at Harvard University and is now executive director of the Evanston Institute for Ecumenical Studies. He contributes a critical introduction on "The Life and Mind of Paul Tillich" which is followed by 24 essays organized in seven major sections. Fromm, Jaspers and Niebuhr contribute to "Religion and the Dilemmas of Contemporary Existence." Barth and Ferré work on "Religion and Creativity." Under "Religion and Language" are to be found essays by Hopper, Przywara and Weigel. Then Bornkamm, Florovsky, Hartshorne, Heim, Loewith and Marcel add to "Religion and the Realms of Reason: Philosophy and Science." The section on "Religion and the Vocation of the Church" includes studies by Adams, Bultmann, Lehmann, Leese and Pauck. Finally, there are two essays by Brunner and Takeuchi on "Religion and the Encounter between East and West" as well as three studies by Bennett, Thielicke and Malik on "Religion and World Order." The work concludes with a complete bibliography of Tillich's writings from 1910-1958.

**STUDIER TILLÄGNADE HJALMAR LINDROTH 17/11 1958** [*Studies in Honor of Hjalmar Lindroth*]. Distributed by Lunde-quistiska Bokhandeln, Uppsala. 73 pp., Sw. Kr. 22.30.

Lindroth, to whom this volume is dedicated, is a systematician at Uppsala University. Ragnar Bring compares the Lutheran concept of law with the metaphysical natural law of positivistic law. On the Lutheran interpretation, the legal basis of society is always rooted in a particular time and place. Therefore unlike natural law, it can have no eternal validity, even though it never loses its character

as real law, as in positivistic law. Harald Eklund's contribution, "A Description of Religious Faith," rejects any definition of religious faith which seeks to separate faith from knowledge. Faith is better defined as knowledge of a higher order. In a study of the universal priesthood, Holsten Fagerberg laments the usual polemical use of the concept in debates on the ministry; we should concentrate on the positive biblical content of the concept and connect it with the idea of the elect people of God. The contribution by Axel Gyllenkrok is a presentation of Rudolf Bultmann's program of theological reform. Lauri Haikola's contribution is a critical discussion of the doctrine of justification in the Apology and the Formula of Concord. Gunnar Hillardal writes on the place and role of the laity in the Swedish church, Bengt Hägglund on the history of the concept of transubstantiation, Gösta Hök on Luther's deepened view of sin and grace resulting from his overcoming the ethic of Stoicism with that of the Sermon on the Mount. Ruben Josefson writes on the ecumenical significance of the teaching of the Lutheran confessions on church unity and church order. From the standpoint of the history of thought, Hampus Lyttkens examines the theological rationale of confession in the ancient and medieval church and in Luther. Gotthard Nygren writes on various aspects of Emil Brunner's view of the "image of God," Per Erik Persson on the function of the Spirit (and the difference in the Protestant and Roman Catholic views), and Gustav Wingren on recent Roman Catholic writings on the ecumenical movement. At the end of the book there is a bibliography of Lindroth's writings from 1926-1957, compiled by Bengt Nord.

**GOTTES NEIN UND JA: VOM GRUND-RISS UND RICHTMASS THEOLOGISCHEN DENKENS** [*God's Nay and Yea: The Structure and Norm of Theological Thought*]. By Ulrich Mann. Hamburg: Furche Verlag, 1959. 142 pp., DM 13.80.

In this work the author, systematician at Tübingen, offers an outline of dogmatics based on Lutheran interpretation of the doctrine of law and gospel (*Nein und Ja*). There are two main divisions: (1) Law and Gospel as an Outline of Dogmatic Thinking (= the prolegomena); (2) Law and Gospel as the Norm of Dogmatics. In his presen-



tation the author examines the understanding of law and gospel in the dogmatic principles of Luther, Barth, Bonhoeffer and Elert; he also devotes much attention to the questions of the method and foundation of contemporary theology, particularly as represented by Bultmann, Tillich, Heim and Rosenstock-Huussy. In attempting to base the necessity and peculiarity of theological dialectic on personalistic thinking, the author draws heavily on a distinction between theology and preaching. This dialectic of law and gospel set forth in the prolegomena is then applied, briefly and concisely, to the doctrines of God, creation, sin, christology, soteriology and eschatology. The author keeps in mind the illegitimacy and the formal and logical inadequacy of statements of dogmatics: at the level of an I-It relationship they must describe an I-Thou relation.

**ROMERSKT OCH EVANGELISKT**  
[*Roman and Protestant*]. By Per Erik Persson.  
Lund: C. W. K. Gleerups Bokförlag, 1959.  
75 pp., Sw. Kr. 4.25.

In the introduction the author states that in relations between Roman Catholics and Protestants we find ourselves in a new and hitherto unprobed situation. In Protestant theology attention is being paid, as hardly ever before, to ecclesiological problems, and there is much discussion of the church, the ministry and the sacraments. In Roman Catholicism the biblical and liturgical revivals are important factors, which seem to give expression to the concerns of the Reformation. Does this mean that the old lines of divergence are now converging? To arrive at an answer to this question, the author attempts to define in the first chapter "The Church's Message" by comparing the Reformation and Roman Catholic views of Scripture, tradition and the magisterial office. Here he discusses also the establishing of dogma in Roman Catholicism in modern times and the essence of the view of the magisterium which sees it as a *regula proxima fidei*. The chapter on "The Living Word" proceeds from the Nicene Creed's confession, recited by both Lutherans and Roman Catholics, of the Holy Spirit as "the Lord and Giver of life." Today a great deal is said in both Roman Catholicism and Protestantism of the living and creative nature of the church's preaching. But as soon as the question of the basis of this common thinking is raised, profound differ-

ences come to light. Protestant teaching finds that the word has life and creative power because it recapitulates the gospel recorded in Scripture. In Roman Catholicism, however, the word's creative power is conditioned by the fact that the Spirit is regarded as speaking primarily through the magisterium: its voice is the voice of the Spirit. In the last chapter, "Christ's Presence in the Church," the author compares Roman Catholic and Protestant views of the ministry. He analyzes the idea at the heart of the Roman Catholic view, namely, that the ministry is a *repraesentatio* of Christ. Persson points out that the difference in Catholic and Protestant views of the ministry reveals a difference in their christologies. The idea of the ministry as a *repraesentatio* of Christ is found in its extreme form in the idea of the cooperation of God and man that is characteristic of Roman Catholic christology. Mariology is an authentic expression of this idea.

**CHANGE AND PROVIDENCE: GOD'S ACTION IN A WORLD GOVERNED BY SCIENTIFIC LAW.** By William G. Pollard.  
New York: Scribner's Sons, 1958. 190 pp., \$3.50.

The author is a physicist and the Executive Director of the Oak Ridge Institute of Nuclear Studies in Tennessee. Since 1952 he has also been an ordained minister in the Episcopal church. In this study he faces the problem of the guidance or intervention of God in a world of scientific law. On the one hand, he sees the activity of God as revealed in the Bible and by theological interpretation through the centuries; on the other, certain natural scientific laws. Dr. Pollard explains the basis of the merger of the biblical idea of providence with the world view of science, and he goes on to state that for him it is found in the appearance of chance and accident in history. The Bohr Principle of Complementarity and von Weizsaecker's distinction between scientific and historic time are key concepts in the reconciliation attempted. These correspond on the scientific side to Buber's I-Thou and I-It worlds, and the biblical paradox of freedom and sovereignty on the religious side.

**DER MODERNE KATHOLIZISMUS UND SEINE KRITIKER** [Modern Roman Catholicism and its Critics]. (*Theologische Existenz heute, Heft 68.*) By Karl Gerhard



Steck. Munich: Christian Kaiser Verlag, 1958. 34 pp., DM 2.00.

The author gives a report of discussions by three Roman Catholics of Walther von Loewenich's book *Der Moderne Katholizismus* (Witten: Luther Verlag, 1955). The result is some revealing insights into the present state of discussions and debates between Protestantism and Roman Catholicism. One of the things the author finds is that their one-sided recourse to Thomism leads Roman Catholic historians to underestimate considerably the influence of the Enlightenment upon the present cultural and intellectual situation; Roman Catholicism, he says, bears a good deal of the responsibility for the rise of secularism, insofar as secularism is a rebellion against the church's claim to power. With respect to Roman Catholicism's use of scriptural "proofs," Steck believes that its dogmatic and ecclesiological interpretation of Scripture keeps it from a fruitful confrontation with the gospel. It is too quick to stamp its approval on its own history, while slighting the real facts of history. This leads the author to a criticism of Roman Catholic teaching on doctrinal authority. The discrepancy between the authority of the magisterium and the quite differently conceived function of theology, whose pronouncements are sometimes binding, sometimes not, in effect deprives theology of authority. Thus the church's absolute claim to truth, which comes to men through the gospel in insecurity and uncertainty, is in Roman Catholicism transformed into a sliding scale of qualifications of the truth. "That means, however, that the real question of the proper reception of the primal truth of revelation in the present situation remains as unresolved within Roman Catholicism as it is without" (p. 29). Finally, the teaching which sets Roman Catholicism apart from other churches is found to be its ecclesiology, which blurs the distinction between Christ and the church. This results in a loss of the awareness of the Risen Lord's judgment of the church and its thought, doctrine and preaching.

KVINNEN OCH AEMBETET ENLIGT SKRIFTEN OCH BEKAENNELSEN [*Women and the Ministry according to the Scriptures and the Confessions*]. Edited by Åke V. Ström. Stockholm: Svenska Kyrkans Diakonstyrelses Bokförlag, 1958. 228 pp., Sw. Kr. 14.00.

In his contribution to this volume, Bo Reike, professor of New Testament in Basel, believes it is sufficiently clear that Jesus as well as Paul looked upon men and women as of equal worth but having different functions in the life of the church. The ministry of the word and sacraments is in principle not part of the function of women, since in preaching the word and administering the sacraments the minister is acting in Christ's stead and as his representative. At home and in the church the man is the image of Christ the bridegroom, while the woman is the image of the church, the bride. This relation is based on the order of creation which, according to the New Testament, is not suspended but rather restored in Christ. On the other hand, says Reike, it is possible to establish on the basis of the New Testament a special ministry for women in the church which would correspond to their functions at home. Åke V. Ström examines the background of Jesus' selection of his apostles and comes to the conclusion that the limiting of the selection to men was not due to the limited perspective of a first-century view of the place of women in society; it was a matter of principle, says Ström. In his study of other aspects of New Testament teaching on the ministry and women, Bertil Gärtner believes that the Christians of the first century were influenced by gnostic teaching to maintain that the difference between man and woman, which is part of the order of creation, has been suspended. Other contributions are by Bo Giertz and Hjalmar Lindroth. The book closes with brief articles by three laymen and a parish pastor.

L'EUCCHARISTIE. MÉMORIAL DU SEIGNEUR. SACRIFICE D'ACTION DE GRACE ET D'INTERCESSION [*The Eucharist: In Memory of the Lord, a Sacrifice of Thanksgiving and Intercession*]. By Max Thurian. Neuchâtel and Paris: Delachaux et Niestlé, 1959. 278 pp., S. Fr. 8.50.

Thurian, a member of the Taizé community, is known through previous publications in which he attempted to rethink specific areas of the church's life and practice, such as confession, marriage and confirmation. The present monograph is occasioned by ecumenical discussions of Holy Communion and by the discussions of the sacrificial aspect of communion going on in many churches. Thurian here attempts to show the relations



between communion and Old Testament prototypes. He examines first the question of the "memorial" and the liturgical framework of the Eucharist. All the concepts of the communion liturgy go back to Old Testament prototypes. Part two is a lengthy examination of the significance of these concepts in their Old Testament setting for the New Testament celebration of the Eucharist. Probably the most important result of this section is that according to the New Testament there is a legitimate sacrificial aspect of the sacrament. In this connection he subjects the words of institution to careful scrutiny. Finally, he treats the question of the prayers in Holy Communion, the question of the real presence and the connection between the sacrament and the church. To summarize his most important theses, Holy Communion is the thanksgiving of the church; in the Eucharist Christ's unique sacrifice becomes present and the believers participate in Christ's intercession. They receive *realiter et substantialiter* Christ's body and blood and are united with all the members of the church universal. The appended outline of a communion liturgy incorporating the results of the study contains a eucharistic prayer, which is preceded by an epiclesis and followed by an anamnesis.

## Practical Theology

KATECHISMUS-AUSLEGUNG. II. Teil: *Taufe, Beichte, Abendmahl* [Exposition of the Catechism, Part II: Baptism, Confession, Holy Communion]. By Herbert Girgensohn. Witten: Luther Verlag, 1958. 110 pp., DM 6.80.

The first part of Girgensohn's work on Luther's catechism has been translated into English by John W. Doberstein (*Teaching Luther's Catechism*, Muhlenberg, 1959, \$4.00). This second part follows closely the text and structure of the catechism in offering a thorough theological exegesis, in non-technical language, of the sections on baptism, confession and Holy Communion. The author inquires into the intentions of Luther's explanations; on the other hand he attempts to show the relevance of the catechism for people today. Biblical references and philological notes on the text of the catechism are connected with theological interpretation which takes account of questions in the

theology and church of the present day. The book is intended not only for persons teaching the catechism but also for lay Christians.

THE SERMON AND THE PROPSERS. *Trinity Season*. By Fred H. Lindemann. St. Louis: Concordia Publishing House, 1959. Vol. 3, 203 pp., \$4.50; Vol. 4, 230 pp., \$4.50.

Like the two previous volumes of this work (see *Literature Survey*, No. 2, 1958), the present ones offer sermon helps arranged according to the church year. Wherever possible the author attempts to find an inner unity in the propsers for each day. Even where such a unity is lacking, as during most of the Trinity season, the author believes that for the sake of the congregation a leitmotif should be sought which will bind together the disparate elements of the worship service. This motif he places at the beginning of each sermon meditation. There follow brief remarks on the various propsers for the day and sermon outlines of the Epistle and Gospel. Special emphasis is laid upon apostles' and Marian days, each of which has in addition to the usual explanatory remarks a complete sermon (taken sometimes from John Gerhard). In the introduction the author calls for a revival of liturgical preaching; only such preaching, he says, can escape the dangers of intellectualism, moralism and emotionalism.

KYRKAN OCH SKOLAN [Church and School]. By Sten Rodhe. Lund: C. W. K. Gleerups Förlag, 1959. 45 pp., Sw. Kr. 3.50.

On July 1, 1958 the last official tie between church and school in Sweden was severed. Against this background, the author, himself a high school teacher of religion, attempts to outline the new relation of the church to the school. After examining the relation between church and school in the USA, France, England, West Germany and the neighboring Nordic countries, the author expresses himself very critically on the idea of having specifically Christian schools established and run by the church. This he bases on the situation in Sweden which he says is different from that in other countries. One of his chief arguments is that the gospel is not the monopoly of pious circles, organizations and schools which may set themselves apart from others in Pharisaic and legalistic righteousness. Rodhe



goes on to discuss the opportunities which the present Swedish situation offers for the proclamation of the gospel—in morning devotions and teaching of religion in the schools and in post-confirmation instruction outside the schools. The author finds that the present task of the church in this area lies not in the creation of Christian schools but in seeking for other ways to make the gospel effective also outside the public schools. The gospel should have a place not only in the teaching of religion but in all the work of the school, which should be informed by love and Christian concern.

**DIE MISSION DER WELTRELIGIONEN**  
[*The Mission of the World Religions*]. By Georg F. Vicedom. Munich: Christian Kaiser Verlag, 1959. 183 pp., DM 8.00.

The purpose of the author, *Missionsinspektor* in Neuendettelsau, is to open the eyes of Christians to developments in the world religions, of which he gives a graphic

description. He traces the beginnings of mission activity in Hinduism, Buddhism and Islam; he pays special attention to the renaissance of the world religions brought about to no little degree by the Christian mission movement and, on the other hand, by the rise of nationalism in the Middle and Far East. In his treatment of the critique of Christianity by the world religions, the author discusses not only the differing conceptions of God and the intermixture of imperialism, colonialism and Christian mission, but also the disappointment of the peoples of Asia and Africa when they found that the gospel had so little effect upon the lives of those who professed belief in it. The author concludes that if the gospel is lived by Christians it can again become a live option for Asians and Africans. This goal can be reached, the author believes, if the word of God is applied to concrete situations, if Christians live exemplary lives and practice true brotherhood, and if "old" and "younger" churches work in close cooperation.

#### Translations

*Old Testament Theology*. By Ludwig Koehler. Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1958. 256 pp., \$4.50.

*An Outline of Old Testament Theology*. By Theodore C. Vriezen. Oxford: Basil Blackwell. 42 s.

*Eucharist and Sacrifice*. By Gustaf Aulén. Philadelphia: Muhlenberg Press, 1958. 207 pp., \$3.50.

*Luther on Worship*. By Vilmos Vajta. Philadelphia: Muhlenberg Press, 1958. 200 pp., \$3.25.

*Theology in Conflict*. By Gustaf Wingren. Philadelphia: Muhlenberg Press, 1958. 168 pp., \$3.25.

---

LITERATURE SURVEY is published as appendix to LUTHERAN WORLD by the Department of Theology, Lutheran World Federation, Director Dr. Vilmos Vajta. The contributors to this issue were: Harm Alpers, Hermannsburg; Albert Anderson, Minneapolis; Horst Beintker, Greifswald; Wesley J. Fuerst, Fremont, Nebraska; Ragnar Holte, Uppsala; Ernst W. Kohls, Münster; Kent S. Knutson, Minneapolis; William H. Lazareth, Philadelphia; Per Erik Persson, Lund; Jürgen Roloff, Geneva; Martin Voigt, Hannover; Hans H. Weissgerber, Allendorf/Lahn; Klaus Zimmermann, Erlangen; Wolfram Zoller, Tübingen.

All inquiries should be forwarded to: Department of Theology of LWF, Geneva, Switzerland, 17 Route de Malagnou.



Subscriptions are payable in advance and may be sent to any of the following addresses:

ARGENTINA	1 year \$1.70 2 years \$3.— (or equivalent)	The Rev. Levon H. Spath Casilla Correo 118, Azul - F.C.N.G. - Roca
AUSTRALIA	1 year 18 Austr. s. 2 years 32 Austr. s.	Lutheran Book Depot 19 O'Connell Street, North Adelaide, S.A.
BRITISH GUIANA	1 year BWI \$3.50 2 years BWI \$6.25	The Rev. Aubrey R. Bowen Buxton Village, E. C. Demerara
CANADA	1 year \$2.75 2 years \$5.—	Canadian Lutheran Council 308 Kennedy Street, Winnipeg 2, Manitoba
DENMARK	1 year D. Kr. 13.— 2 years D. Kr. 22.—	The Rev. Arne Thomsen Vendersgade 28, Copenhagen K
ETHIOPIA	1 year Eth. \$5.— 2 years Eth. \$9.—	The Rev. Herbert Schaeffer American Lutheran Mission, Box 1899 Addis Ababa
GERMANY	1 year DM 8.80	Lutheran World 17 route de Malagnou, Geneva
HONG KONG and TAIWAN	1 year HK \$10.— 2 years HK \$18.—	Lutheran Literature Society 33 Granville Road, Kowloon, Hong Kong
ICELAND	1 year I. Kr. 30.— 2 years I. Kr. 54.—	
INDIA	1 year 9 Rupees 2 years 16 Rupees	The Christian Literature Society Post Box 501, Park Town, Madras 3
INDONESIA	1 year \$1.75 2 years \$3.— (or equivalent)	The Rev. Gerhard Reitz c/o Nommensen University, Pematang Siantar, Sumatra
JAPAN	1 year 700 Yen 2 years 1200 Yen	Lutheran Literature Society 11, 1 Chome, Iida Machi, Chiyoda Ku, Tokyo
LIBERIA	1 year Lib. \$1.75 2 years Lib. \$3.—	Mr. James McKay Lutheran Mission, Monrovia
MADAGASCAR	1 year CFA Fr. 400 2 years CFA Fr. 720	Imprimerie Luthérienne Avenue Grandidier, Tananarive, B.P. 538
NEW GUINEA	1 year 18 Austr. s. 2 years 32 Austr. s.	Lutheran Mission Press Madang, Terr. of New Guinea
NIGERIA	1 year 12 WA s. 2 years 21 WA s.	Sudan United Mission Bookstore Yola
NORWAY	1 year N. Kr. 13.— 2 years N. Kr. 22.—	The Rev. Henrik Hauge Røahagan 25, Røa, Oslo
SWEDEN	1 year Sw. Kr. 11.— 2 years Sw. Kr. 19.—	The Rev. Åke Kastlund Jakobsbergsgatan 19, III, Stockholm
TANGANYIKA	1 year 12 EA s. 2 years 21 EA s.	Vuga Mission Press P.O. Soni, via Tanga
UNION OF SOUTH AFRICA	1 year 12 SA s. 2 years 21 SA s.	The Lutheran Publishing House 150 Bellevue Rd., Durban
UNITED KINGDOM	1 year 14 s. 2 years 25 s.	Lutheran Books, Ltd., 71 Edgware Rd., Marble Arch London, W. 2
UNITED STATES	1 year \$2.75 2 years \$5.—	National Lutheran Council 50 Madison Avenue New York 10, N. Y.

If there is no agent in your country or area, subscriptions may be sent directly to LUTHERAN WORLD, 17 route de Malagnou, Geneva, Switzerland, at the rate applicable in your country or the country nearest you.

LUTHERAN WORLD also appears in German. All inquiries concerning the German edition should be addressed to: *Lutherische Rundschau*, Kreuz-Verlag, Lange Strasse 51, Stuttgart N, Germany.